Beginning of

The growth of individualism among the Hebrews

This title was preceded by

The building of a curriculum for the religious education of adolescents of senior high school age

Apocalypticism in Buddhism

The use of the New Testament in the curriculum of religious education for early adolescence

And is continued by

The search for truth in India

Search by above titles on archive.org to continue reading this collection of Pacific School of Religion Theses from 1923 call number Thesis Cage 1923

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024 with funding from
Graduate Theological Union

https://archive.org/details/b14098544

THE GROWTH OF INDIVIDUALISM

AMONG THE HEBREWS

Marion Hiller Dunsmore

A.B., Kalamazoo College, 1920
M.A., Pacific School of Religion, 1922

A thesis submitted in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Bachelor of Divinity
in the Department of Old Testament
Literature and Semitic Languages
of the Pacific School of Religion.

Berkeley, California

May, 1923.

PREFACE

It was originally planned to cover the whole period of Hebrew literature in this survey of the growth of individualism. But a further study of the subject soon made clear that such a survey would assume the proportions of a fair sized book, and would go far beyond the limits of a thesis such as this one. Consequently it was found necessary to end this treatise with a discussion of the work of Ezekiel, who was the first writer to clearly formulate a distinctive doctrine of individualism. The author hopes that some time he may be able to complete this study by a similar treatment of the post-exilic period.

No attempt has been made in the following study to discuss the dates of the various books and documents of the Old Testament. The dates commonly assigned to them by modern scholars have been accepted. In the discussion of the prophets only those passages have been utilized which are generally recognized as authentic writings. Where doubtful passages have been cited an attempt has been made to note the fact in the footnotes.

In the preparation of this thesis only books written in English have been consulted. There are important works upon the subject in German, but limited time and a limited knowledge of the language have prevented their utilization. In addition to the books listed in the bibliography numerous critical works have been consulted in regard to the genuineness of passages, dates, etc. It has been the endeavor of the writer to make use of the accepted results of critical scholarship, and yet make this treatise as non-technical as possible, while still holding true to this purpose.

The writer is especially grateful to Professor William Frederic Badè for his assistance so freely and generously given, both within and without the class room, and is greatly indebted to his book, "The Old Testament in the Light of To-day." Much use has also been made of J.M.Powis Smith's book, "The Prophet and his Problems," whose chapter entitled, "The Prophet and the Individual" is one of the best treatments of the subject.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the problem 1

Chapter I

THE SOLIDARITY OF THE SOCIAL GROUP IN EARLY ISRAEL

The Family. The Cult of the Dead. The Clan and the Tribe. The Nation. The Law of Blood-revenge. God and the Solidarity of the Social Group. Summary . . . 2

Chapter II

GROUP MORALITY IN EARLY ISRAEL

Moral Responsibility within the Group. Moral responsibility and Outsiders. God and Group Morality. Summary 13

Chapter III

The EFFECT OF THE SETTLEMENT IN PALESTINE UPON GROUP SOLIDARITY

Agriculture and Landownership. The Growth of Large Towns. The Establishment of the Kingdom. The Monarchical Institutions--The royal revenue--The army--The Corvee. Commerce. Fusion with the Canaanites. Summary . 18

Chapter IV

THE SEER, SAGE, AND PRIEST

The Seer. The Sage. The Priest 29

Chapter V

THE EIGHTH-CENTURY PROPHETS

I. Amos. The Religion and Morality of Amos' Time--The idea of God--The cultus. Amos' Contribution to

CONTENTS

the Idea of God and Morality. Morality versus Cultus. Amos' Theodicy. Summary. II. Hosea. III. Isaiah. The Remnant. IV. Micah. Summary 29

Chapter VI

DEUTERONOMY AND JEREMIAH

I. Deuteronomy. II. Jeremiah. Summary 44

Chapter VII

EZEKIEL AND THE EXILE

I. The Exile. Factors which aided in the Growth of Individualism. II. Ezekiel. 51

CONCLUSION 57

BIBLIOGRAPHY 60

The Growth of Individualism among the Hebrews.

INTRODUCTION.

It is sometimes said that the Old Testament deals with God's relations with the nation, Israel, while the New Testament treats of his relation with individual souls. This statement contains some truth, but like all generalizations, is not strictly true. The interest of much of the Old Testament is primarily in the nation as a whole, and not in the individuals who make up the nation. But this is not true of the whole of the Old Testament. The emphasis in the New Testament upon the value and worth of the individual does not mark a sharp cleavage from the Old Testament teaching, nor the promulgation of an entirely new doctrine.

When we trace out the development of religion in the Old Testament,--and the only proper way to understand the Old Testament is to regard it as a record of the progressive, developing revelation of God to man as man has been seeking after God, and as a history of this revelation as it has been applied to the problems of life,--we find that the Hebrews slowly emerged from the idea of group solidarity and group responsibility and came to a consciousness of individualism and individual responsibility. The development of these great ideas was slow, and many factors entered into their growth.

It is the purpose of this thesis to trace out the main course of this development, and to discuss some of the factors which helped to bring it about.

CHAPTER I

THE SOLIDARITY OF THE SOCIAL GROUP IN EARLY ISRAEL.

Among the early Semitic peoples individual persons, in the modern sense of the term, scarcely existed. The individual was almost entirely lost in the solidarity of the social group, whether the group was the family, the clan, the tribe, or the nation. The Hebrew people proved no exception to this rule.

It does not lie within the scope of this paper to go back to the beginnings of Hebrew history, nor to trace out in detail the origin of that nation. It will be sufficient for our purpose to begin with the Hebrew people at the time of the "conquest of Palestine,"--that period when a number of kindred nomadic and semi-nomadic tribes pushed in from the desert, and, sometimes singly, sometimes unitedly, slowly conquered the native inhabitants, and settled down among them upon the fertile soil of Canaan. They were not then a unified nation, and rarely, if ever, did they all unite against the Canaanites. However the common enemy drew these independent tribal units closer together, but it was not until the time of Solomon that real unification took place,--in as far as it was accomplished at all. It is the organization of these clans and the families which composed them, rather than the history of this period, which commands our attention.

It needs to be noted that the sources of our information for this early period come from a later date. The two oldest written sources, the J and E documents, come from a period long after the establishment of the kingdom.[1] Theycan be used as direct sources only for the period from which they come, which is long after the Hebrews had settled in the land, and their customs and beliefs had been modified by the more highly developed divilization in which they found themselves, and by the new customs and practices which the agricultural mode of life necessitated. But as indirect sources they <u>are</u> valuable, and

1. The J document dates from about 850 B.C., the E document from about 750 B.C.

together with the materials from other kindred Semitic peoples, they form a means of ascertaining much concerning this earlier period.

THE FAMILY.

Among the early Hebrews, as among other Semitic peoples, the family furnished the basis of the social and religious organization. It is difficult for us today to realize the importance of the bond of blood relationship. But in ancient times blood kinship furnished the only ground for the construction of the social group. Anthropologists do not agree as to the origin of the family, nor of its earliest form. But long before the period which we are discussing the family life among the Hebrews had reached the patriarchal stage.[1] At the head of this family was the patriarch, or "ruling father." Obviously, in primitive times, the protection of one's rights could be effected primarily only through the family, and likewise, the family group furnished the only possibility of government. Consequently it is natural that the family should have assumed a prominent place.

As a social unit the family meant much more than it means today, and also included much more. At the head of the family group was the father, or as he is often called in Hebrew, the "baal." Where this word occurs in the Old Testament, it is variously translated "master," "owner," "husband," etc. He was the owner of his wife, or wives, children, slaves, cattle, lands, etc. It is interesting to note that in an early law code (E) there occurs the expression, "the baal of the ox,"[2] which is rendered in English as "owner;" while in the same code occurs the phrase "baal of a wife."[3] So the same term is used to signify the proprietorship of a wife and the ownership of an animal.

This, however, gives us a glimpse into the organization of the family. The authority of the father was practically supreme. The wife was regarded as property,[4] and she was obtained

1. Some anthropologists take the position that the clan as an organization antedated the family, and that primitive man probably lived under a matriarchate. But that is a problem for anthropologists and sociologists to work out. Whatever may have been current among the primitive Semites, the fact remains that within the historical period among the Hebrews the patriarchal family was the basis of organization.
2. Ex. 21: 28 (E). 3. Ex. 21: 2 (E). 4. Ex. 20: 17 (E).

by purchase, either in money or goods,[1] and the husband's rights over her were practically those of a master over a slave. She could not share in the inheritance of property, and she had no independent recognition in the religious cultus.

Likewise the power of the father over his children was supreme. It extended even to the matter of life and death. Thus Abraham, in the thought of that time, could with impunity offer Isaac as a sacrifice,[2] and Jephthah could fulfill his awful vow and offer up his daughter as a burnt offering.[3] The father could sell his children as slaves.[4] Provision was made that a male Hebrew slave should be manumitted in the seventh year, but if he had been given a wife by his master, the wife and children remained the property of the master.[5] Children who struck or cursed their fathers or mothers were to be put to death.[6]

The father was also the religious head of the family. He attended to the religious cultus, acting as priest for the family. At a sacrificial feast he slew the animal, offered up the deity's share and presided at the sacrificial meal.

The sons remained with the father and built up his "house." The daughters went to the "houses" of their fathers-in-law. The father was indemnified for the loss of a daughter by the payment of a dowry, the amount depending upon the dignity of the father and the beauty of the maiden, the bargain usually being made without consulting her.[7]

From what has just been said, it will be seen that the members of the family scarcely could be called individual persons with individual rights. Their individuality was almost wholly swallowed up in the solidarity of the group. However, it might seem at first thought that while the members of the family were regarded as property, the patriarch himself was somewhat of an individual in the modern sense of the term. But he was intimately bound up with the family. It was the family that gave him his position, and without the family his importance would cease. Nor was he as independent as might seem to appear. He was

1. Gen. 34: 12 (J).
2. Gen. 22: 1-18 (E). It is not necessary to discuss the historicity of this incident. Even if it be proved unhistorical it would not invalidate it for our purpose.
3. Jgs. 11: 29-40
4. Ex. 21: 2, 7 (E).
5. Ex. 21: 4 (E).
6. Ex. 21: 15, 17 (E).
7. See Gen. 24: 50, 51; 29: 18-20; I Sam. 17: 25.

inseparably connected, not only with his family, but also with his ancestors, and his welfare, especially in the after life, was dependent upon his descendants. To properly understand this point brief mention will be made of the cult of the dead.

THE CULT OF THE DEAD.

It is altogether too little recognized that ancestor worship existed among the early Hebrews, reaching back at least to nomadic times. There are numerous survivals of this cult in the Old Testament.[1] The tombs of the heroes were given an important place, for they were really regarded as sanctuaries where the spirits of the departed dwelt and where they were worshipped, and where offerings were presented to them. It was a great advantage to be buried with one's ancestors, for thus one stood a better chance of having the proper respects paid to him. Jacob, just before he died, made Joseph swear that he would not bury him in Egypt. "But when I sleep with my fathers," he said, "thou shalt carry me out of Egypt, and bury me in their burying place."[2]

The welfare of the spirits of the dead was dependent upon the cultus carried on by their descendants. The bones of Joseph were brought from Egypt in order that they might rest among his offspring.[3] But it was only through male descendants that ancestor worship could be carried on, and the spirits of the dead could be cared for. Consequently great importance is attached to male offspring in the Old Testament. No greater calamity could befall a man than to die without a male child. If this did happen, and there was not a trusted slave to take the place of the son,[4] the family ceased to exist as a religious and civic unit. This belief gives significance to the words of Amos, "And I will make it as the mourning for an only son, and the end of it as a bitter day."[5] Bitter indeed would be the day when an only son died, and there was no male descendant left to carry on the cultus, and the spirits of the ancestors would suffer great discomfort and would finally "peter out."

1. See Dt. 14:1; 26:24; etc.
2. Gen. 47:30 (J).
3. Josh. 24:32.
4. Gen. 15:2 (JE).
5. Amos 8:10.

To guard against such a calamity the practice grew up that when a man died without a male heir, his brother was to marry the widow, and the first son born of this union was counted as the son of the deceased, and could carry on the continuity of the family.[1]

The cult of the dead was still in existence at the time of the writing of Deuteronomy.[2] The Deuteronomists, however, regarded it as idolatrous and legislated against it.[3] This is an indication of how widespread the practice really was. One writer even goes so far as to say, "The patriarchal family, which we find fully developed in Israel, usually rests on the religious basis of ancestor worship."[4]

The point of this discussion of the cult of the dead for our purpose is to show the solidarity of the family, both the living and the dead. The individual did not stand alone. He was inseparably bound up with his ancestors and with his living family, and his welfare in the life hereafter was dependent on an unbroken line of male descent.

THE CLAN AND THE TRIBE

The family, as we have alread seen, was the basic unit of organization among the Hebrews, but there were also larger units constituted along similar lines. Suppose, for example, we take a family such as Jacob's, with twelve sons, each having his own family, and yet Jacob still remaining the patriarch and judge. After his death, while the families would be independent to a degree, still a sense of kinship would remain, and they would be bound together by the blood-bond. They would have much in common, expecially the family religion. Such a group would constitute a clan.[5] The head of the largest, strongest, or oldest family would probably be the chieftain. This is the organization found today in the Arab world with its sheikh, or elder. Of course in actual practice other factors would probably enter in to modify the simplicity of the illustration. A stranger might be assimilated, as was Moses into the family of Jethro.[6] Or a

1. Dt. 25:5f; cf. the Book of Ruth.
2. About 650 B.C.
3. Dt. 14:1; 26:14.
4. Smith, H.P.: The Religion of Israel, p.33.
5. See note 1, p.3.
6. Ex. 2:16-22 (J).

clan might settle down in a place and unite with the inhabitants with whom they were not closely related by blood kinship. The acceptance on the part of the one of the religion of the other would cement the union and soon they would be thought of as of common blood. Such a union was contemplated between the clan of Jacob and the Shechemites, but a feud prevented it.[1]

The tribe may be thought of as an enlarged clan, just as the clan has been pictured as an enlarged family. While actual blood kinship always remained an important factor in determining any group, yet it was not the only factor. Neighboring clans of different blood often had to either fight or fuse, and they often fused and formed a tribe.

During the period of the conquest, the Hebrews were in the tribal stage. They were not yet organized into a nation. "In those days there was no king in Israel."[2] Each tribe had its own leader,--a kind of arbitrator who was known as a "judge." His authority, however, was not supreme, but was subject to the approval of the council of elders, representing the various families comprising the tribe.[3] In the conquest of Palestine the various tribes often fought alone. But sometimes a number of them would cooperate against a common foe. A passage in the book of Judges well illustrates this. "Then all the Midianites and the Amalekites and the children of the east assembled themselves together; and they passed over, and encamped in the valley of Jezreel. But the Spirit of Jahveh came upon Gideon; and he blew a trumpet; and Abiezer was gathered together after him: and he sent messengers unto Asher, and unto Zebulun, and unto Naphtali; and they came up to meet them."[4] So Gideon gained prestige beyond the limits of his tribe. "Then the men of Israel said unto Gideon, Rule thou over us, both thou, thy son, and thy son's son also; for thou hast saved us out of the hand of Midian."[5] While Gideon never became king, he is representative of the type of men to whom the people turned for leadership when the time came to unite the tribes into a nation.

But it was not a common enemy alone which drew the tribes

1. Gen. 34 (JE).
2. Jgs. 21:25.
3. Cf. Isa. 1:26.
4. Jgs. 6:33-35.
5. Jgs. 8:22.

together. Religion was as strong a factor. While each tribe of the Hebrews had its own special religious observances, and its own sanctuaries,[1] yet it was the worship of Jahveh which was the bond of union in the great emergencies.[2] "Instead of saying, therefore, that the Hebrew people at the close of the period of the Judges were all those who had descended from Abraham, the common ancestor, it would be historically correct to say that they were all the people who through kinship or by assimilation had come to be worshipers of Jehovah."[3] But those who had a common religion usually came to regard themselves as descended from a common ancestor and consequently related by blood kinship, for nationality and religion were inseparable.

THE NATION

It will not be necessary for our purpose to discuss the development of the nation. The first king, Saul, resembled very much the judges of the previous period. He was the leader of the tribes in war and the judge in peace. He maintained a simple court where people might come to obtain justice.

In the conquest of Canaan the original inhabitants were by no means all exterminated. Probably for the most part the Hebrews conquered the highlands first and settled there and then slowly extended their rule into the lowlands.[4] Great numbers of the Canaanites remained in the land and were absorbed into the nation. The Jahveh worship of the Hebrews became fused in part with the Baal worship of the Canaanites, and so in the course of time, the two dissimilar people became one and were regarded as descendants of a common ancestor, bound together by kinship. The nation is frequently referred to as "the children of Israel (or Jacob),"[5] not, of course, with the present day connotation of the phrase "children of ----" in which degrees of relationship can be determined, but in the sense of being related to and being a part of the great social group known as "Israel." So, in a way, the nation may be said to be an extension of the family, with the king having many rights similar to those of the patriarch. In large measure the people

1. See Dt. 33: 18f (E); Jg. 18. 2. See Jg. 1: 1f; 5: 2; 7: 18; Isa. 4: 3-6. 3. Soares, T. G.: The Social Institutions and Ideals of the Bible, p. 110. 4. See Jg. 1: 1, 2, 19, 27, 29-34.
5. Lit., 'sons of Israel.'

were regarded as the property of the king. Thus we see that the idea of solidarity which we found in the smaller social groups also applied to the nation.

It is not to be supposed, as this discussion might seem to indicate, that the smaller units were superseded by the larger ones. They still continued to exist and still had an important place in the social organization.

THE LAW OF BLOOD-REVENGE

Perhaps no better illustration of the solidarity of the group can be cited than that of blood revenge. "The members of one kindred looked on themselves as one living whole, a single animated mass of blood, flesh, and bones, of which no member could be touched without all the members suffering."[1] Consequently the whole kin was answerable for the life of each of its members. If a member of the clan was slain by an outsider the thought of the other members of the clan was, "Our blood has been spilt," and it was the duty of the clan to avenge the death by killing the manslayer or one of his kin. The responsibility for this rested upon the clan until the murder was avenged, even though it should not be accomplished for several generations.

It is difficult for us to grasp this idea of the solidarity of the group, for the idea of kinship with us is affected by degree and circumstance. "In ancient times, on the contrary, the fundamental obligation of kinship had nothing to do with degrees of relationship, but rested with absolute and identical force on every member of the clan. To know that a man's life was sacred to me, and that every blood-feud that touched him involved me also, it was not necessary for me to count cousinship with him by reckoning up to our common ancestor; it was enough that we belonged to the same clan and bore the same clan-name."[2]

Of course in the larger groups, the tribe and nation, this practice had to be somewhat modified, for the death of a single individual would not have the same effect upon, nor importance

1. Smith, W.R.: The Religion of the Semites, 2d ed., p. 274. See also Jg. 19: 2; Gen. 29: 14(J); II Sam. 5: 1; 19: 12.
2. Smith, W.R.: ibid, p. 273.

for the nation as it would upon a smaller group. So the practice among the Hebrews during most of the Old Testament period was for the nearest kinsman of the slain to assume the role of the blood-avenger, and retaliate by the slaughter of the murderer or one of his kinsmen. A number of examples of this are to be found in the Old Testament. "And when Abner was returned to Hebron, Joab took him aside into the midst of the gate to speak with him quietly, and smote him there in the body, so that he died, for the blood of Asahel his brother... So Joab and Abishai his brother slew Abner, because he had killed their brother Asahel at Gibeon in the battle."[1] If the nearest of kin[2] did not succeed in his duty, the responsibility passed on to his sons and grandsons until the bloodshed was finally avenged. Thus David permitted the Gibeonites to hang the children of Rizpah and Michal in order that the crime of their grandfather, Saul, might be expiated.[3]

GOD AND THE SOLIDARITY OF THE SOCIAL GROUP

The Semitic peoples regarded the gods as belonging to the social group. Each group had its own god or gods, and the principle of solidarity between the gods and their worshippers was fundamental. Of course this is natural, for among early peoples those things which are characteristic of political society also appear in the sphere of religion. Consequently if a person was taken into a new social group, he necessarily adopted a new god.[4] Conversely, when one was excluded from the group, he was also separated from the god. Thus when Saul was pursuing David, and they met, David said to Saul, "If it be Jahveh that hath stirred thee up against me, let him accept an offering: but if it be the children of men, cursed be they before Jahveh, for they have driven me out this day that I should have no share in the inheritance of Jahveh, saying, Go, serve other gods. Now therefore let not my blood fall to the earth away from the presence of Jahveh."[5] Likewise in the Book of

1. II Sam. 3:27,30. See also II Sam. 14:6-11; Ex. 22:2f (E).
2. The Hebrew term for blood avenger is "go'el." It is used a number of times in this sense; e.g. Num. 35:12; Dt. 19:6,12; Josh. 20:3,5,9; II Sam. 14:11. It is also used to signify the one who had the right to redeem property (i.e., the nearest kinsman); e.g. Lev. 25:25; Ruth 4:4,6. So it comes to be used for kinsmen in general; e.g., Num. 5:8; Lev. 25:25; Ruth 3:12; I Kings 16:11. The same root is used in "the redeemed of Israel" Isa. 35:9; 51:10.
3. II Sam. 2:1-9. 4. Ex. 2:16-22(J). 5. I Sam. 26:19,20.

Ruth, Naomi says to Ruth, "Behold, thy sister-in-law is gone back unto her people, and unto her god (or gods)." Ruth replies, "Thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God."[1]

The gods were believed to share in the wars and feuds of their worshippers. The enemies of his people were the enemies of the god. And so in the Old Testament the phrase "enemies of Jahveh" originally meant nothing more than the enemeies of Israel.[2] It was believed that in battle each god fought for his own people, and frequently the image or symbol of the god was carried into the battle. Thus when the Hebrews carried the ark into battle against the Philistines, "the Philistines were afraid, for they said, Gods are come into the camp... Woe unto us! who shall deliever us out of the hand of these mighty gods?"[3]

The welfare of the god and his people was mutual. Consequently he fought with them against their enemies, who were also his enemies. And they fought not only for themselves, but also for their god. This is the meaning of the curse against Meroz in the Song of Deborah.

> "Curse ye Meroz, said the angel of Jahveh,
> Curse ye bitterly the inhabitants thereof,
> Because they came not up to the help of Jahveh,
> To the help of Jahveh against the mighty."[4]

These illustrations show sufficiently well the solidarity of Jahveh and his people, bound together as they were by the inseparable bonds of kinship. The moral and ethical aspects of this relationship will be treated in the following chapter.

SUMMARY

This survey has shown that individuals, in the modern sense of the term, did not exist among the early Hebrews. The fundamental characteristic governing social and religious life was the principle of group solidarity. The individual was swallowed up in the group. The basis of organization was the family, based on blood-kinship. This was expanded, in the clan and tribe and nation, to include others who were not really

1. Ruth 1: 15-16. While the Book of Ruth is post-exilic, nevertheless it well reflects the ideas of this earlier period, and so is a legitimate reference here.
2. I Sam. 30: 26; Jg. 5: 31. 3. I Sam. 4: 7, 8. 4. Jg. 5: 23.

physically related, but who adopted the same religion and came to be regarded as belonging to the same kinship. The feeling of solidarity which permeated the family also permeated the larger social and political units, even the nation. Inseparably bound up with his people was Jahveh, who belonged to the Hebrews alone. Thus we find the early Hebrews and their God, mutually dependent upon one another, solidified by the ties of kinship into one social and religious group in which the individual as such had practically no place.

CHAPTER II.

GROUP MORALITY IN EARLY ISRAEL

The morality of a society based upon the idea of the solidarity of those of the same kin, naturally must be a group morality. So the whole group would be affected by the deeds of one member, and conversely, the various members would be affected by the group as a whole. As has been seen in the law of blood revenge, the murder of a member of a clan involved the whole clan. Upon the whole clan rested the responsibility for the avenging of the death of the kinsman by the killing of the slayer or some member of his family or clan. To a large measure, also, the limits of morality were fixed by tribal lines; that is, the laws of morality applied only to members of the same group, and did not include outsiders. Thus we find a group morality and a collective responsibility. The various aspects of these ideas among the Hebrews can best be shown by a number of illustrations from the early period.

MORAL RESPONSIBILITY WITHIN THE GROUP

The sin of a member of the group involved the whole group. Of course in early times sin did not mean what it means for us today. Rather it meant the violation of the ritual or the breaking of a taboo. When the Israelites under Joshua had captured Jericho, all the spoil was placed under the ban.[1] But one man, Achan, violated this taboo, and took some silver and gold, and clothing, and hid them in his tent. It is illuminating to note the wording of this early narrative: "But the children of Israel committed a trespass in the devoted thing (i.e., the spoil which had been placed under the ban), for Achan...of the tribe of Judah, took of the devoted thing: and the anger of Jahveh was kindled against the children of Israel."[2] So while one man, according to our standards, was guilty, to the writer of the story it was the "children of Israel" who "committed a trespass." As a result of this sin the whole army was defeated at Ai, and it was not until Achan, his family, and all that belonged to him had been stoned and burned that victory again

1. Josh. 7: 1ff (JE). 2. Josh. 7: 1 (RJe)

came to the army. It indeed seems unjust treatment from our point of view that his sons and daughters who were entirely innocent of their father's deed should be put to death. But from the viewpoint of the Hebrew of that time they were regarded as property and had no individual rights. The contagion of the violated taboo was believed to spread to everything which the father owned, and the only way to free the whole people from the curse was to destroy everything connected with him.

Another incident, bringing out much the same idea, but from a different angle, is that of the numbering of the people by David.[1] David took a census of the people, and it was regarded as a sin by Jahveh, and consequently he had to be punished. So Jahveh offered him his choice of three punishments: seven years of famine, pursuit by his enemies for three months, or a three days' pestilence in the land. David chose the latter, "and there died of the people from Dan even unto Beersheba seventy thousand men." Yet David himself was not touched by the pestilence. This is a good illustration of collective responsibility. The king sinned. The responsibility rested upon the whole people and the punishment fell upon them. To us it might seem that David was not punished, while a multitude of innocent people were, but not so in the Semitic thought of that time. For just as the whole nation was collectively responsible for David's sin, so he also was punished in their punishment.

MORAL RESPONSIBILITY AND OUTSIDERS.

Among the early Hebrews laws of morality were applicable only to those of their own number. The non-Hebrews were "outside the law." In primitive society anyone who did not belong to the clan was a foe or a potential enemy of that clan and so must be guarded against. This idea persisted even in national life. So the sixth commandment, "Thou shalt not commit murder,"[2] is a prohibition against the slaying of one's fellow countrymen, not a general command against the taking of human life. The importance of the law of blood revenge has already been noted. Now this commandment was not in conflict with that law, which

1. II Sam. 24.
2. Ex. 20:13 (E). The word used here רצח is not the usual one for "kill," but rather signifies "murder," so I have used the latter.

still remained operative, and it was still the duty of a man to kill in order to avenge the death of a kinsman. Likewise this commandment did not apply to warfare or to the conquered peoples, for there are a number of instances where all the males or even the entire population of conquered cities were massacred at the express command of Jahveh.[1]

This feeling towards foreigners, which existed even at the time of the promulgation of the Deuteronomic law is well illustrated by several of its provisions.

> "At the end of every seven years...every creditor shall release that which he hath lent unto his neighbor; he shall not exact it of his neighbor and his brother... Of a foreigner thou mayest exact it."[2]
>
> "Ye shall not eat of anything that dieth of itself: thou mayest give it unto the sojourner that is within thy gates, that he may eat it; or thou mayest sell it unto a foreigner; for thou art a holy people unto Jahveh thy God."[3]
>
> "Unto a foreigner thou mayest lend upon interest; but unto thy brother thou shalt not lend upon interest."[4]

These laws show that the idea of morality did not extend beyond the lines of kinship. One could with impunity do to an "outsider" those things which it was wrong to do to one's fellow-countryman.

GOD AND GROUP MORALITY

We have already spoken of the solidarity of Jahveh and his people, and have seen that he was a partisan deity. Consequently he would share in the ideas of morality which his people possessed, and he was regarded as possessing many of the powers and characteristics of the patriarch. So he was jealous and became angry with his people when they sinned, and he punished them. But as was seen in the case with Achan and David, the punishment was sent upon all the people, --the innocent and the guilty alike.

Being a partisan deity Jahveh was bound to take the part of his own worshippers in their dealings with other peoples, who, of course, belonged to other gods. Thus in the well-known story of

1. See Josh. 6: 17-24 (JE); Dt. 13: 15ff; I Sam. 15: 33.
2. Dt. 15: 1-3. 3. Dt. 14: 21. 4. Dt. 23: 20.

Abraham's journey to Egypt, Abraham, fearing for his own safety, lied to Pharaoh, saying that Sarah was his sister.[1] So Sarah was taken into the harem and Abraham was well treated and enriched. Then when Jahveh brought a plague upon the court, Pharaoh found out the truth, and he sent Sarah back to Abraham and sent them away, with all their possessions. Thus through deception Abraham was enriched and Jahveh took the part of his client. To the writer of this story there was nothing wrong in this, for Abraham had a perfect right, according to his standard, to deceive the Egyptian, who was "without the law," and Jahveh necessarily had to take his worshipper's part against the worshipper of another god.

One of the earliest commandments is the prohibition contained in the first commandment: "Thou shalt have no other gods before (besides) me."[2] Another early law states: "He that sacrificeth unto any god save unto Jahveh only, shall be utterly destroyed."[3] There are many examples in the Old Testament of Jahveh being provoked to anger because his worshippers turned to other gods, and so punishment after punishment was inflicted upon the people for this cause. The welfare of Jahveh was threatened if the people who belonged to him should turn to the support of other deities. So the second commandment states: "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image... for I, Jahveh thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, upon the third and the fourth generations of them that hate me."[4]

Thus we find Jahveh the God of Palestine and of its people, Israel, a thorough-going partisan, swayed by passions similar to those of men, inseparably bound up with his people, and conditioned by their ideas of group morality.

SUMMARY

This survey of early Israel has set forth the basic principles of the life and religion of the early Hebrews,--the solidarity of the group (including both Jahveh and his people, Is-

1. Gen. 12: 10ff (J). 2. Ex. 20: 3 (3). Probably an early form of this law read: Thou shalt not prostrate thyself before any other god.
3. Ex. 22: 20 (E).
4. Ex. 20: 4f (E)

rael), and the consequent corollary, group morality.

Of course it would not be true to state that the individual was absolutely without recognition. For wherever people are found there will also be found certain personal experiences and characteristics which differentiate one individual from another, and these do have some effect upon the social mass. But "the solidarity of the family, clan, or tribe was so ingrained in the whole life and thought as to render it extremely difficult for the consciousness of individuality and personality to assert itself and vindicate its rights."[1]

With this as a background, it will now be our task to examine the various forces and factors, which, coming into play, modified these principles, and broke down the old ideas, letting the idea of individualism and individual responsibility come forth into the light.

1. Smith, J.M.P.: The Prophet and His Problems, p. 169.

CHAPTER III.

THE EFFECT OF THE SETTLEMENT IN PALESTINE UPON GROUP SOLIDARITY.

When the Hebrew tribes entered Palestine they were nomads or semi-nomads. A distinction needs to be drawn between these two classes. The pure desert nomads (or Bedawin) were inhabitants of the arid steppes. They regarded agriculture as a disgrace, holding such work beneath their dignity and independence. The camel was their chief support, furnishing both milk and a means of transportation. Lack of water prevented the raising of other domestic animals. Dates and camel's milk furnished the main articles of diet, although other supplies were obtained by making raids into cultivated territory, and by exacting tribute from farmers, herdsmen, and caravans. They had no fixed places of abode, but lived in tents which could easily be moved from place to place. That a portion of the Hebrews were pure nomads seems to be born out by the fact that centuries later we find in Judah a class of people known as Rechabites, who, though they had become half-nomads, still preserved strong aversions against agrarian culture. They refused to engage in agriculture, to drink wine, or to build houses. Instead they dwelt in tents and sought to live as far as possible the simple life of the desert.[1]

The half-nomads marked a sort of transition between pure nomads and agriculturists. They were chiefly shepherds and herdsmen, sometimes combining a little farming with their stock-raising. They lived a more settled life than did the nomads, usually living along the edges of the desert. However, it was often necessary to move from place to place in order to find pasturage for the flocks and herds. Usually, therefore, they lived in tents. According to Hebrew tradition the patriarchs were half-nomads.[2]

1. See Jer. 35.
2. A number of scholars hold that the stories of the patriarchs are not accounts of the lives of individuals, but that the characters of the stories are the personifications of tribes. Whether or not this is true makes little difference for our purpose, for whether the characters are real or are representations of tribes, the state of society represented is semi-nomadic.

AGRICULTURE AND LANDOWNERSHIP

To us of the western world it might seem that Palestine was not a very rich land, nor very large. But it was capable of supporting a fair sized population, and in the eyes of the desert wanderer who longed for water and harvests it seemed marvelously rich. The Deuteronomist represents Moses as saying to the children of Israel who were about to enter Canaan: "For Jahveh thy God bringeth thee into a good land, a land of brooks of water, of fountains and springs, flowing forth in valleys and hills; a land of wheat and barley, and vines and fig-trees and pomegranates; a land of olive-trees and honey; a land wherein thou shalt eat bread without scarceness, thou shalt not lack anything in it; a land whose stones are iron, and out of whose hills thou mayest dig copper. And thou shalt eat and be full, and thou shalt bless Jahveh thy God for the good land which he hath given thee."[1]

The Canaanites who inhabited the land were agriculturists who had entirely passed the nomadic stage of development. Many of them lived in towns which were fortified against the desert invaders, and they had reached a relatively high degree of civilization. Egypt had long held sway over Palestine and had extended her civilizing influences. Into this agricultural land and civilization came the Hebrews, and while to some extent they continued as shepherds and herdsmen, yet their chief interest became agriculture, which they took over from the people among whom they settled. During the whole period of their national history the Hebrews were predominantly an agricultural people, and practically the whole of the compilation of laws in the Pentateuch deals with this agricultural stage of development.

Among nomadic peoples there is no such thing as individual ownership of land, but the group as a whole owns a given district in common, in so far as there is land proprietorship at all. But among an agricultural people individual ownership is very important. We cannot here go into a discussion of the development of the idea of the proprietorship of land. but the Canaanites had reached this stage, and regarded the land as a lawful item of commerce, and they bought, sold, and rented it, and used it as

1. Dt.8:7-10.

security for mortgage loans, etc.

The materials in the early Hebrew writings are too meagre to enable us to make a definite statement concerning the methods followed by the Hebrews in the early period in Palestine in the matter of the ownership and inheritance of land. It is certain that the ideal division of land by lot, as set forth by the priestly writers centuries later, could not have taken place while there were so many Canaanites still in possession.[1] The earliest law codes contain no reference to land tenure. The Deuteronomic code lays a curse upon the one who should remove his neighbor's boundary stone,[2] thus indicating that land was definitely marked out and owned. David purchased the threshing floor of Araunah, the Jebusite, for fifty shekels of silver,[3] and built there an altar unto Jahveh. Ahab wanted to buy the vineyard of Naboth, but Naboth refused because he regarded it as an inheritance which it was improper to alienate.[4]

Thus we may say that private proprietorship of land was early adopted by the Hebrews in Palestine. Individual ownership makes against group solidarity for it means that the individual has property of his own which it is to his interest to care for and protect. A man's personal property naturally becomes more important to him than the common property of the group to which he belongs and it claims his foremost interests. Likewise agriculture, with its settled mode of life, and its diversity of industry, tended to bring the individual towards the front, for in this new life so much more depended upon individual initative and effort.

THE GROWTH OF LARGE TOWNS

Agricultural life naturally means a settled life and calls for permanent dwelling places. However, the Hebrew farmers did not live apart from one another on their farms, as is the practice in this country. Such procedure would have been too dangerous. We have already noted that the Canaanites found it necessary to build walled cities as a protection against desert

1. See Josh. 18-19(P). Of course the priestly writer assumed that the Canaanites were all exterminated from the land.
2. Dt. 27: 17; cf. Dt. 19: 14.
3. II Sam. 24: 18ff.
4. IKings 21: 1-4.

nomads and other foes. Likewise as a protective measure the Hebrew farmers gathered together in villages, choosing places where there was a good supply of water. During the day they worked in the fields and at night they came back to the shelter of the village.[1] But the village alone did not offer sufficient security, and so after the manner of the Canaanites, fortified cities were built for increased protection. Probably many of the "cities" were little more than villages with walls built around them. Surrounding many of these walled towns were villages which were not fortified, but which depended upon the towns to defend them. Thus in the lists of the cities in the book of Joshua, there is always the addition "with their villages,"[2] and sometimes there occurs the picturesque expression, "the city with its daughters."[3]

Now this development of towns and cities modified the ancient clan and tribal government. Usually most of the inhabitants of a town would belong to the same clan, but the whole clan or tribe would not live in the same town, but would be scattered over a considerable territory and into a number of towns. Then each city was more or less sufficient within itself, having its own elders as a governing body; and the elders of the city came largely to take the place of the elders of the tribe.[4] Thus the growth of towns tended to break down the old bonds of tribal solidarity, although of course still holding largely to the idea of the related group. But nevertheless the new group was organized along different lines and was a step away from the old idea of tribal solidarity.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE KINGDOM

During the period of the conquest there was no centralized authority among the Hebrews. Occasional leaders arose who would lead several tribes to battle against a common foe, and who afterwards would be regarded as fit arbitrators in matters of dispute. So they became known as "the Judges." Then as the tribes became settled in the land a need for closer federation

1. See Jg. 19:16; I Sam. 11:4,5; Ruth 2.
2. Josh. 15:19. Josh. 15:45, marg.
3. See Num. 21:25, marg; 32:42, marg.; cf.
4. See Jg. 8:4ff, 16; Ruth 4:2; I Sam. 11:3

as a protective measure against the common enemies became necessary. It is not within the scope of this paper to discuss the factors entering into the formation of the kingdom, nor the steps by which it took place. The important thing is that the establishment of a monarchical government weakened the feeling of the exclusiveness, the sufficiency, and the solidarity of the tribe. The power of the king became strong at the expense of the clan, and the nobility of the royal court came to overshadow almost entirely the old nobility of the lesser groups. So while there was still the feeling of mass solidarity in the nation, it could not be as binding as in the lesser divisions which the nation was now superseding, for the very largeness of the group meant a weakening of the old idea of solidarity. "The greater the extent to which social integration is carried, the larger the opportunity for the individual of exceptional talent."[1]

THE MONARCHICAL INSTITUTIONS

The Royal Revenue. The people were forced to support the king, his court, the army, and the corvée. The king's tax seems to have been regarded as a tenth of the produce of agriculture and of the flocks.[2] He also had a right to the first mowing of the grazing lands in order to supply food for his horses.[3] In order to secure supplies for his great court, Solomon divided the kingdom into twelve districts, each district to supply food for a month.[4] These divisions did not correspond with the boundaries of the tribes. This was probably partly due to the fact that the old tribal lines were no longer of great importance, and partly also due to the desire of Solomon to minimize the danger from the old social organization.

The Army. One of the necessities of the kingdom was an army, and this called for the absence from home of a large number of men for long periods of time. This consequently weakened family ties. Thus "David put garrisons in Syria of Damascus... and throughout all Edom he put garrisons."[5] Not only did it weaken family ties, but the fact that the Hebrews were stationed among foreign peoples would tend in some measure at least to broaden their outlook.

1. Day, Edward: The Social Life of the Hebrews, p.66.
2. Isa.8:15, 17.
3. Amos 7:1; I Kings 18:5
4. I Kings 4:7-19.
5. II Sam.8:6, 14.

The basis of organization in the army was numerical rather than tribal. Besides the high commanding officers there were captains of thousands,[1] captains of hundreds,[2] and captains of fifties.[3] Of course it may well be that the men in the various companies of fifties, hundreds, etc., would be from the same clan, but the unit was not primarily one of kinship, but was numerical, and tended to break away from the idea of tribal relationships.

Military appointments were made, not on the basis of tribal affinities, but upon merit as shown by conspicious deeds of valor, loyalty, and efficiency. In the list of the "mighty men whom David had" there is a brief sketch of the conspicious bravery of each, by reason of which each was made a captain.[4] Thus there was here offered a chance for individual initiative.

The Corvée. Not only were men taken from their homes for service in the army, but many were also forced to labor upon the public works. "And king Solomon raised a levy out of all Israel; and the levy was 30,000 men.[8] And he sent them to Lebanon, ten thousand a month by courses; a month they were in Lebanon, and two months at home."[5] This labor in a foreign land for long periods of time meant the weakening of clan associations.

COMMERCE

Commerce was one of the important factors which widened the outlook of the Hebrews, and which offered new fields for the development of individual talent. Important trade routes lay through Palestine, connecting Egypt with Damascus and the East. From the Tel-el-Amarna tablets we learn that a vigorous trade was carried on over these routes and had reached large proportions in the later Canaanitish times.[6] The story of Joseph presents a good picture of a trading caravan. "And, behold, a caravan of Ishmaelites was coming from Gilead, with their camels bearing spicery and balm and myrrh, going to carry it down to Egypt."[7]

1. I Sam.8:12. 2. II Kings 11:4.
3. I Sam.8:12; II Kings 1:9-13. 4. II Sam.23:8-39.
5. I Kings 5:13,14; cf. I Sam.8:16. 6. Gen.37:25ff (JE)
7. Gen.37:25 (J).
8. It may well be that the writer has here enlarged the figures, but that Solomon had a corvée is quite certainly an historical fact.

Under the monarchy commerce increased. Solomon kept the trade routes open and protected, and took tribute from the merchants.[1] He also made an alliance with Hiram, king of Tyre, whereby the Israelites were to receive timbers of cedar and fir in exchange for food stuffs.[2] Palestine, having no natural harbors, was to a large measure dependent upon the Phoenicians for access to the Mediterranean Sea. However, the Red Sea trade was open to the Hebrews. David conquered the Edomites[3] and took possession of their port of Ezion-Geber. "And king Solomon made a navy of ships in Ezion-Geber... on the shore of the Red Sea... And Hiram sent in the navy his servants, shipmen that had knowledge of the sea, with the servants of Solomon... Once every three years came the navy... bringing gold, and silver, ivory, and apes and peacocks."[4]

So the Hebrews also came to purchase of the foreign goods and luxuries which these ships and caravans brought. The prophet Amos condemned the idle rich who enjoyed their ivory and tapestries in the summer-houses and winter-houses, who lounged upon their divans and ivory couches, who drank from the "big bowl," who smeared themselves with the finest oils.[5]

While the Hebrews were primarily an agricultural people in pre-exilic times, and no great commercial class arose among them, yet to some extent they shared in international commerce. Commerce always tends to develop individuals, and international commerce tends to break down group solidarity.

FUSION WITH THE CANAANITES

We must not lose sight of the importance of the Canaanites themselves in modifying the old idea of the exclusiveness of the clan based upon blood-kinship. We know that the ideal conquest in a single generation, with the complete extermination of all the original inhabitants did not take place. On the contrary, large numbers of the Canaanites remained and the two peoples at first lived side by side. Furthermore, it was necessary for the Hebrews to learn from them the art of agriculture

1. I Kings 10:15. 2. I Kings 5:6-12.
3. II Sam.8:14. 4. I Kings 9:26,27; 10:22.
5. Amos 6:1-8. See also 3:15.

and the mode of living in settled communities. To a large extent Jahveh became identified with the baals of the Canaanites and, having much in common in religion the two peoples came to regard themselves as one. This intercourse and amalgamation with the earlier inhabitants "helped to hasten the deterioration of the clan."

SUMMARY

Thus the settlement in Palestine with the agricultural mode of living, the fusion with the Canaanites, the establishment of the monarchy, and the rise of commerce, created an environment in which the clan spirit and organization of nomadic life could not continue indefinitely. Under the new conditions, and as the social group enlarged, there was afforded greater opportunity for individual development. "Everything which strengthened the bonds of national unity at the same time hastened the dissolution of the clan organization and the weakening of clan loyalty."[1]

1. Smith, J.M.P.; The Prophet and his Problems, p. 177.

CHAPTER IV

THE SEER, SAGE, AND PRIEST

THE SEER

Among the early Hebrews we can distinguish roughly two classes of "men of God"--the seer and the prophet. Both, in a measure, were spokesmen of Jahveh, though usually using different means. It is perhaps impossible to know the exact relation between the two. It is thought by some that the two offices represent two distinct lines of development. Others hold that the seer represents a stage of development of prophecy. The former seems to be the better explanation.

One way of contrasting the prophet and the seer is to think of the prophet as a "forth-teller," and the seer as a "foreteller." But a more important distinction for our purpose is the fact that the prophet, especially the greater ones, was concerned mainly with the people as a whole and with their relation to Jahveh.[1] The seer was interested in the individual members of the nation and their troubles, and the people went to him for help and advice about the affairs of everyday life.

The seer, by various means, such as dreams, signs, omens, and the lot, looked into the future and foretold what was to take place, or secured the desired information. In early Israel one of the means of gaining this information was by the possession, on the part of the seer, of a "familiar spirit," through whom he received the desired knowledge. Saul visited the witch of Endor, and she called up the spirit of the dead Samuel in order to find out from him about the outcome of the battle with the Philistines, and to find out why Jahveh had forsaken Saul. But even at this time there had grown up opposition to necromancers and wizards, and Saul had banned them from the kingdom.[2] So these persons, forced to give up their "familiar spirits," nevertheless continued their practice, but used less objectionable means.

1. The prophets had a most important effect upon the development of individualism, and especially of individual responsibility. The following chapters will largely deal with their work.
2. See I Sam. 28.

Samuel is a good example of the better type of seer (although he is also a prophet). He is often spoken of as"the man of God," and people went to him to ask about matters of every conceivable kind, many times not religious in the sense in which we think of religious matters today. When Saul was unable to find his father's asses, his servant suggested that they go to the seer, Samuel. They did so, and he was able to tell them that the asses had been found. For this information they paid him a fee. Thus the work of the seer was mainly with individuals and dealt with matters of their everyday life as distinct from things involving the group as a whole.

THE SAGE

In later pre-exilic times this function of giving counsel in individual affairs seems to have belonged primarily to the sage, or the"wise man," as he is often called. It is not unlikely that the sage was a development and refinement of the earlier seer. By the time of Jeremiah the sages were regarded as a distinct class, ranking with the priest and prophet. "For the law shall not perish from the priest, nor counsel from the wise, nor the word from the prophet."[1] Just how early this class arose it is impossible to tell. Joab sent a "wise woman" to rebuke David.[2] At the time of Sheba's rebellion, another "wise woman" advised that Sheba the Benjaminite be delivered up to Joab.[3] Solomon himself was regarded as a man of exceedingly great wisdom,[4] and as one example of this the story is told of his wise judgment in the case where two women claimed the same baby.[5]

"The sage was essentially individualistic both in the method and the substance of his teaching.[6] He concerned himself with the common, practical interests of ordinary, every-day life. He

1. Jer. 18:18. 2. II Sam. 14:2ff. 3. II Sam. 20:16f
4. I Kings 4:29-34; 10:4ff. 5. I Kings 3:16-28.
6. The author here adds a note, which is, in part, as follows: "The Wisdom literature is, of course, of postexilic origin; hence it might be inferred that the activity of the sages was an outcome of the adoption of the individualistic point of view rather than an efficient factor in the development of that point of view. It is scarcely supposable, however, that a type of literature so rich in content and so widely differing from all that had prededed it could have sprung up, as it were, in a night, independently of any preparatory work. It is easier to believe that the Wisdom thought had representatives in the earlier period of Hebrew history, and that this school found its great opportunity for influence in the conditions of the exilic and postexilic periods and at that time came to the front in literary activity."

met men face to face on the streets and at the city gates and gave them counsel on matters arising from their relations to each other as individuals. All his work laid emphasis upon the moral responsibilities of individuals; he had nothing to do with men in the mass, but confined himself to the individual member of society and, for the most part, apparently, to the affairs of private life. The whole trend and influence of his work from the outset must have been individualistic to a high degree. The outcome of his activity as seen in the Wisdom literature, Proverbs, Job, Ecclesiastes, Ecclesiasticus--the most individualistic books in the Old Testament--is sufficient warrant for the claim that the teachings of the earlier sages exerted a predominantly individualistic influence."[1]

THE PRIEST

While the function of the priesthood was primarily national, yet it also had its individualistic features. In the passage quoted above from Jeremiah[2] are the words, "the law shall not perish from the priest." Thus the priest was the guardian of the law. It was his duty to instruct the people in the laws of the ritual and to see that the ceremonial requirements were fulfilled. But it was also his duty to act as judge in disputes, both religious and secular, which arose between members of the community. "The administration of justice is necessarily individualistic in tendency. The rights of the individual as such inevitably assert themselves sooner or later. The injustice of punishing one man for the crimes committed by another, even though they may be of the same blood, cannot be overlooked for long in a progressive community. The proper relation between crime and punishment is maintained only when it is the criminal himself who suffers the punishment."[3]

Thus the seer, sage, and priest, in their work with individuals, were important factors in the development of individualism. In the following chapters we will discuss the work of the great prophets whose work led up to a full recognition of individual responsibility.

1. Smith, J.M.P.: The Prophet and his Problems, p. 177f.
2. Jer. 18: 18.
3. Ibid, p. 180f.

CHAPTER V

THE EIGHTH-CENTURY PROPHETS

The discussion thus far has dealt mainly with those factors, aiding the growth of individualism, which were due to the new environment and the different conditions of living which the change from nomadic to agricultural life brought about. We have also noted the individualizing tendency of the work of the seer, sage, and priest. Yet in spite of all these things it may seem that very little definite progress towards individualism had been made by the eighth century when the first of the writing prophets appear. Nevertheless all these factors were at work and were preparing the way for new teaching and higher ideals. The prophets, by their insistence upon morality and a spiritual religion, had a most important part in the growth of the idea of individual responsibility. Therefore we need to discuss their work somewhat at length.

It has already been pointed out that the prophet was interested primarily in the nation. "His concern was with national problems, perils, and hopes. The interests of individuals, as such, were below the level of his gaze; they came into view only in so far as they affected the public weal."[1] But the teachings of the prophets, which set forth new ideas of God and higher ideals of the relationship between him and his people, and of the people towards each other, could not but have an individualizing influence, for any real progress in morality and religion was bound to bring a fuller recognition of individual rights. We will begin with a discussion of the teachings of Amos, the first of the eighth-century prophets.

I. AMOS

Amos was the first of the prophets whose writings have come down to us. He was a great pioneer in the field of morality, and while not dealing with the individual as such, yet his teachings were an important factor in the development of the idea of the moral responsibility of the individual, and of the punishment of the individual for his own sins.

1. Smith, J.M.P.: The Prophet and his Problems, p. 168.

The work of Amos was primarily with the nation. However, what might seem at first glance to be a case of individual responsibility and individualizing theodicy is the incident of the encounter of Amos with Amaziah the priest. As a result of Amaziah's sin Amos tells him that he shall die in a land that is unclean. But also, as a part of his punishment, Amos says, "Thy wife shall be a harlot in the city, and thy sons and thy daughters shall fall by the sword and thy land shall be divided by line, and Israel shall surely be led captive out of his land."[1] So, after all, this is a case of group responsibility.

Before we take up the teaching of Amos we should have in mind the main ideas of God and of morality of his time. This has been presented in a former section, and so here it will be necessary to present but a brief summary, in order that we may contrast with it the teaching of Amos.

THE RELIGION AND MORALITY OF AMOS' TIME

The Idea of God. Jahveh, in common with other Semitic deities, was believed to be the God of a particular people and confined to the particular land which his people inhabited. His rule did not extend beyond the boundaries of his land, and so when one of his worshippers went to another country it meant going out "from the face of Jahveh," and adopting other gods.[2] Jahveh and his people were inseparably bound up in one group. He was a partisan deity and necessarily must be the protector of his people, and so he was believed to share in the ideas of morality which they possessed. Thus he was always expected to take their part in their dealings with outsiders, who, not belonging to the group, were not protected by its morals and laws. Jahveh was regarded as being anthropopathic. He was easily provoked to anger by failure on the part of his worshippers to carry out the ritual properly, by the violation of a taboo (as in the case of Achan),[3] or by the worship of other gods, and his punishments fell upon all the people, guilty and innocent alike.

The Cultus. We need also to note the place and importance

1. Amos 7:17.
2. See II Sam. 26:19,20; Ruth 1:15-16.
3. Josh. 7:1ff (JE)

of the cultus among the Hebrews. At the time of Amos there had developed no clear distinction between the cultus and religion. Practically the whole of religion consisted in supporting and carrying out the proper ritual. In nomadic times this was comparatively simple, and consisted mainly in certain ceremonies to be observed when a sacrificial feast was held,--the manner of slaying the victim, and the offering of certain parts to the deity. But with the settlement in Palestine the cultus became more elaborate. The Canaanites were an agricultural people and believed in a number of agricultural deities, called Baals, whom they worshipped at various sanctuaries. The Hebrews naturally regarded these places as sacred, for a sanctuary was thought to be sacred, even though it did not belong to one's own deity. When the Hebrews settled among the Canaanites, they absorbed much of their civilization, and also much of their religion. They came to identify the various Canaanite deities with Jahveh, and as these deities became identified with him, their sanctuaries became his.

Probably every town or village of importance had its sanctuary. Hosea states, "They sacrifice upon the mountains, and burn incense upon the hills, under oaks, and poplars, and terbinths."[1] Likewise it is stated that in the reign of Rehoboam, "Judah did that which was evil...for they also built them high places, and pillars, and asherim, on every high hill, and under every green tree."[2] Naturally only a few of these sanctuaries would attain to any great importance beyond their own communities, but some would, and to these people would make pilgrimages from all parts of the land. Amos mentions three of these, Bethel, Gilgal, and Beersheba.[3] His prophesying was mainly at Bethel. This was a royal sanctuary,[4] and consequently ranked high in importance.

To such a sanctuary people would go at the time of the great feasts. A man with his family, and perhaps with invited guests, would sanctify themselves,[5] adorn themselves in festive array,[6] and would take with them a sacrificial victim, and abundant food and wine with which to make merry,[7] for these pilgrim feasts[8] were

1. Hos. 5: 13.
2. I Kings 14: 23.
3. Amos 5: 5.
4. Amos 7: 12.
5. See I Sam. 15: 5; Num. 11: 18(J); cf. Ex. 19: 10, 14 (E).
6. Hos. 2: 28.
7. See I Sam. 10: 3.
8. Or, haggim.

joyous, festive occasions. At the sanctuary the animal was slain and flayed, and the blood poured out on the altar. This, together with the kidney fat, which was burned upon the altar, constituted the deity's share. The priest, where there was one, also took toll, and, in addition, often imposed fines for alleged violations of the ritual.[1] The remainder of the flesh was eaten by the sacrificer and his party, together with wine and bread and probably other food.

Along with the feasting there was merrymaking, dancing, and not infrequently, drunkenness and gross licentiousness, for at the sanctuaries were "holy ones"--male and female religious prostitutes.[2] All of this was done in the name of religion, or rather, was regarded as religion itself. Consequently a very high degree of morality could not be expected when one's whole religious obligation consisted in carrying out the cultus. Against such a view of religion Amos and his successors took a firm stand.

AMOS' CONTRIBUTION TO THE IDEA OF GOD AND MORALITY

There are several fundamental respects in which Amos changed Israel's conception of God. (1) While he did not break with the idea that Jahveh was a national God and that his power was practically limited to Palestine, he did modify the national-god idea by stating that Jahveh's relation to Israel was a voluntary one. "You only have I known of all the families of the earth."[3] He had chosen Israel as his people. So instead of being their God because they dwelt in his land, Palestine, and instead of being dependent upon them for his welfare, he was independent of these things, and having chosen Israel, he could also dissolve the relationship.

(2) Jahveh, while a national God was not without interest in other nations. At the beginning of his book, Amos pronounces judgments upon the surrounding nations, as a result, in part, of their conduct toward Israel. But it is to be noted that in the case of Moab,[4] that Moab is condemned for her sin against Edom, in which Israel is not directly concerned. Also, Jahveh is

1. See Amos 2:8; Hos. 4:8.
2. See Amos 2:7; Hos. 4:14; Dt. 23:17.
3. Amos 3:2.
4. Amos 2:1ff.

represented as saying that he "brought Israel up out of the land of Egypt and the Philistines from Caphtor and the Syrians from Kir."[1] So Jahveh's interest was not entirely confined to Israel. Thus we find a breaking away from the old idea of the exclusiveness of the nation and its God.

(3) But the most important thing is that Amos represents Jahveh as a moral being. Instead of being a deity whose welfare depended upon the welfare of his people, and who must consequently become a partner to their deeds, he is a moral being not dependent upon his people, and he demands of them moral character. Being such a God he is bound to punish them for lack of morality, even to the point of their destruction. Thus Amos represents Jahveh as saying, "You only have I known of all the families of the earth; therefore I will visit upon you all your iniquities."[2] Under the then current view of God, the people would have expected Jahveh to say, "You only have I known of all the families of the earth; therefore I will take your part in all your affairs, and will protect you in everything you do." But with the new conception of God which Amos sets forth, comes the judgment, "therefore I will visit upon you all your iniquities." A moral God requires morality among his worshippers.

MORALITY VERSUS CULTUS.

Since God is a moral being he demands righteousness and justice among his people. He will not accept offerings and sacrificial feasts as substitutes for these. He will not be a partaker in, nor condoner of, their unrighteousness. On the contrary, because he has chosen them there is all the more reason why he must punish them if they persist in unrighteousness. Consequently Amos opposes the old view that religion consisted in carrying out the regulations of the cultus. Since the cultus consisted largely in the offering of sacrifices and in sacrificial feasts, Amos bitterly opposes them. He represents Jahveh as saying,

"I hate, I abhor your dances,
I cannot accept the smell of your worship,

1. Amos 9:7. 2. Amos 3:2.

I like not your gifts, I look
Never once at your sacrifices of fat calves.

Take away from Me the noise of your songs,
I will not listen to the music of your harps!
Let righteousness spring up like water
And justice as a rushing brook!"[1]

We find here in Amos, for the first time in the prophecies which have come down to us, a distinction between cultus and religion, and the claim that religion and morality are inseparable. Furthermore he states that the sacrifices which the unrighteous worshippers were offering were not only without value, but were positively sinful.

"Hither to Bethel, come and do mischief,
To Gilgal and do great mischief!
Bring the next morning your offerings,
And on the third day your tithes!

Offer praise,--but of leavened baking,
Proclaim loudly your free-gifts:
That verily is what you like, O Israelites.
This is the utterance of Iahweh, the Lord
of all."[2]

Instead of these sacrifices Jahveh asks that his people "let justice roll down as waters, and righteousness as an ever flowing stream."[3] He goes on to say,

"Seek good, not evil,
That you may live
And that Iahweh may be with you,
As you say so much!

Hate evil, not good;
And make justice strong..."[4]

Thus Amos practically makes "seeking Jahveh" and "seeking good" the same thing. So instead of "seeking Jahveh" by visiting a sanctuary and offering sacrifices, a moral significance is given to this "seeking Jahveh." Morality and religion, claims

1. Amos 5:21-24. 2. Amos 4:4,5. 3. Amos 5:24f.
4. Amos 5:14f.
1, 2, and 4 are quoted from Duhm, B: The Twelve Prophets, tr.by A. Duff. Lond. 1912. p.69f, 64, 67.

Amos, are inseparable. But we must not lose sight of the fact "that the morality of the prophets is not the inner, universal morality of the human soul, but the civic and social morality of the Hebrew as a member of the Israelite commonwealth. It is this latter morality of which Amos conceives Jahveh to be guardian and which, together with the purely mundane benefits of its practice, he has in mind when he says, 'Seek good and not evil, that ye may live.'[1] Jahveh's favor is the guarantee of the nation's life, of its perpetuity. According to current popular views it is secured by abundant sacrifices and the faithful observances of feast-days and ceremonial. According to Amos it can be secured only by the honest administration of justice;[2] by the retention of simple life and manners;[3] by the protection of the weak and the poor;[4] by the practice of honesty and brotherliness;[5] and by the eschewing of sexual and other excesses."[6][7] Yet in a sense these things are dependent upon the individual and they tend towards a consciousness of individual responsibility, although neither Amos nor his immediate successors went so far as to clearly enunciate it.

AMOS' THEODICY

We have already noted that in Amos there is no thought of an individualizing theodicy, nor is there any belief in punishment in the hereafter. While the soul continued to exist, good and bad alike had only a shadowy, undesirable existence in a common dwelling place, called Sheol,--conceived of as a great pit or cave beneath the earth. Jahveh's power did not extend to Sheol, so he had to punish people during their life upon earth.[8] These punishments were usually community-wide, and as instruments of punishment Jahveh used natural phenomena. Amos makes mention of a number of these,--famine,[9] drought,[10] blight and decay,[11] locusts,[12] pestilence,[13] earthquakes,[14] eclipse of the sun, an occurence greatly dreaded by ancient peoples,[15] captivity,[16] war,[17] plundering and destruction,[18] and fire.[19] Thus it will be

1. Amos 5:14. 2. Amos 2:6; 5:10, 15. 3. Amos 6:4f.
4. Amos 5:11; 8:6. 5. Amos 5:12; 8:5. 6. Amos 2:7.
7. Bade, W.F.: The Old Testament in the Light of To-day, p. 150f.
8. See Amos 9:2. 9. Amos 4:6. 10. Amos 4:7.
11. Amos 4:9. 12. Amos 4:9; see also 7:1f.
13. Amos 4:10. 14. Amos 8:8; see also 3:14f. 15. Amos 8:9f.
16. Amos 1:15; 5:27; 7:17. 17. Amos 1:4, 7f, 10, 12; 4:10; 6:14; etc.
18. Amos 3:11; 5:3f; 7:9; 9:4. 19. Amos 7:4.

seen that Amos was still well within the realm of group solidarity and collective responsibility.

SUMMARY

Amos materially aided in modifying the old view of group solidarity by his teaching that Jahveh and the nation were not inseparably bound together, but that Jahveh's choice of Israel was a voluntary one, and he could reject them if their sins made it necessary; by claiming that Jahveh had some interest in other nations; by maintaining that Jahveh was a moral being and demanded a moral character in his worshippers; by insisting that Jahveh did not want sacrifices, but justice and righteousness, or, in other words, that religion and the cultus were not the same; and by his claim that morality and religion are inseparable. While Amos did not carry out the individualistic implications of his teachings, they were nevertheless there, and were later to assert themselves. We find in the prophecies of Amos a great forward step in the progress of morality and religion, and such a progressive step was bound to bring a fuller recognition of individual rights and individual responsibilities.

II. HOSEA

Hosea was a younger contemporary of Amos, working in the same environment and against the same sins and practices and beliefs as did Amos. Yet the two men differed greatly in many respects. Amos was a stern moralist, sitting in judgment upon the people. Hosea likewise pronounced them guilty, but his judgment was tempered by the sorrow and heartache of his own personal experience. For the marital relations of Hosea had been most unfortunate. He had an unfaithful wife who made shipwreck of their married life. As he thought over this experience, he came to believe that Jahveh had divinely ordered this in order to cause him to understand the relation of Israel to Jahveh. Jahveh was the husband, Israel was the unfaithful wife. Just as Hosea still loved his unfaithful wife who went away with her paramour, and went after her, and found her, and bought her, and brought her back, so also Jahveh yearned over unfaithful Israel who had gone after her paramours, the baalim. So while the

keyword of Amos is justice, the keyword of Hosea is love.[1]

Hosea, like Amos, deals with the relation of God to the nation as a whole, and not with individuals. Yet some of his teachings have individualistic implications. He denounces the sins of the people. "Jahveh has an indictment against the inhabitants of the land," he says, "because there is no truth, nor goodness, nor knowledge of God in the land. There is nought but swearing and breaking faith, and killing, and stealing, and committing adultery."[2] Now these sins are sins of individuals, but Hosea was still bound by the idea of group morality. Condemnation rested upon the nation as a whole because of these sins. But the very fact that there was a consciousness that condemnation was upon the nation because of these sins, could only mean that it was now but a matter of time until the responsibility for them would be placed back upon the individuals who were guilty. It is difficult for us of modern times to see how these early prophets failed to grasp the idea of individual responsibility, but the idea of group solidarity, with its corollary group morality, was so firmly entrenched in the Hebrew mind that it was extremely difficult to dislodge it.

Hosea also followed Amos in opposing the cultus. He represents Jahveh as saying,

> "It is not slain offerings that I desire, but love;
> Not burnt offerings,--but knowledge of God!"[3]

By "the knowledge of God" Hosea means the relationship of Israel with God which exists between husband and wife, not intellectual knowledge. Again he says, "Sow to yourselves in righteousness, reap according to love."[4] So in place of the ritual, Hosea places the moral qualities, righteousness, love, and the knowledge of God, which, in the last analysis, cannot be in the group unless they are in the hearts of the individuals.

Hosea's greatest contribution was the idea of love,--the love of Jahveh for his people, and the love which he seeks from

1. In his "The Old Testament in the Light of To-day, p. 154, Prof. Bade translates this word as "loyal love." He adds the following note: "Hesed is difficult to translate because it comprehends several meanings which must be rendered by different words in English. Thus it signifies not only 'goodness' and 'kindness,' but also 'love' or 'affection' as shown by the parallel phrase 'love of thine espousals'(to Jahveh) in Jer. 2:2 The context and symbolism show that Hosea uses the word

(see next page)

his people, manifesting itself in the doing of his will. True it is that to Hosea, Jahveh is still a national God,-- a jealous, angry husband. Yet he is also a loving husband, a "God that cares, that loves, that suffers, that never gives up."

"When Israel was a child
I fell in love with him,
And (Ephraim) out of Egypt
Did I call unto Me...

I put Ephraim in leading-bands, taking him
Firmly by the arms--
(And yet they run away from Me)
They refuse to return...

"Oh, Ephraim, how should I so treat thee?
Oh, Israel, how should I give thee up?"[5]

The prophets who came after Hosea were all greatly influenced by this teaching of love. Of course in the early prophets "the firer moral distinctions of an individualistic theory of human conduct are wanting, and the feeling of individual responsibility must have been vague. But love, even in the Hebrew sense of the word, looks forward to individualism. Therefore Hosea took a long stride forward when he declared that the love of God should be the mainspring of human conduct."[6]

III. ISAIAH

The message of Isaiah was not essentially original. He simply carried on the work of Amos and Hosea, giving to their teachings a new form and an added force. It is not within the scope of this paper to discuss the great work of Isaiah as a statesman, nor as a poet, though he was supremely great in both respects. Rather, we must confine ourselves to his main moral and religious teachings. Isaiah, like his predessors, sought

primarily in this sense. But because he intentionally lets it overflow into other meanings in the same connection I have indicated its occurence parenthetically in the translation."
2. Hos. 4: 1, 2.
3. Hos. 6: 6. (Duhm's translation, op. cit., p. 95). The parallelism of the Hebrew poetry shows that this is a better translation of the Hebrew than that of the Revised version which translates "more than burnt offerings."
4. Hos. 10: 12. Duhm regards this as secondary. Some others regard it as authentic. It seems to give the thought of Hosea.
5. Hosea 11: 1ff. (Duhm's translation, op. cit., p. 107f.
6. Bade, W. F.: The Old Testament in the Light of To-day, p. 165f.

to make religion a matter of character rather than of ceremony and ritual, and of course, like theirs, his interest was mainly in the nation as a whole. But he did make some important contributions to religious thought by carrying forward their teachings and giving to them new vitality and meaning.

Isaiah thought of Jahveh as a God of holiness. His favorite name for him is "The Holy One of Israel," and he gives us that wonderful representation of Jahveh surrounded by seraphim[1] who guard his presence and proclaim,

"Holy, holy, holy is Jahveh of hosts."[2]

But Isaiah did not use the term "holy" in the then current sense of the term, which was mainly ritualistic, and which can perhaps be best summed up in the now commonly used Polynesian word "taboo." While Isaiah still retained the old idea of inapproachableness and inviolability in the word "holiness," he nevertheless gave the term an ethical meaning. "In declaring Jahveh an ethical personality this ceremonial attribute of the Godhead (i.e. holiness) necessarily had to acquire ethical significance also. It must be accounted Isaiah's most distinguished service to the religion of Israel that he gave to Jahveh's holiness a fulness of ethical meaning which made it possible to say: 'The holy God shows himself holy through righteousness.'"[3]

This ethical holiness on the part of Jahveh demands ethical conduct and living on the part of his worhippers. "Woe is me!" says Isaiah, "for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips, for mine eyes have seen the King, Jahveh of hosts."[4] Again, Jahveh complains, "This people draw nigh, and with their lips do honor me, but have removed their heart far from me, and their fear (worship) of me is a commandment of men which they have learned by rote."[5] In place of mere externalities of ritual Jahveh wants ethical righteousness within the heart.

1. These mystical divine beings are nowhere else mentioned in the Old Testament.
2. Isa. 6:3.
3. Bade, W. F.: The Old Testament in the Light of To-day, p. 178. The author adds the following note: "Is. 5:16. This verse doubtless is part of an insertion by a later hand, but it expresses Isaiah's implicit thought precisely. Unfortunately both the A.V. and the R.V. miss the force of the passage altogether by making God 'sanctify' himself, whatever that may mean."
4. Isa. 6:5.
5. Isa. 29:13, marg.

Isaiah set forth an enlarged conception of Jahveh. In contrast to the popular conception that Jahveh dwelt within the inner sanctuary of the temple, Isaiah in his vision saw him "sitting on a throne, high and lifted up; and the hem of his robe filled the temple."[1] And the seraphim cried unto one another,

"Holy, holy, holy is Jahveh of hosts,
The whole land is full of his glory."[2]

So in Isaiah's thought Jahveh was not dependent for his dwelling place upon a little sanctuary built by men's hands. The whole land was his dwelling place.

Isaiah pictured Jahveh as serene and tranquil. "For thus has said Jahveh to me, I will be still, and I will look on in my dwelling-place; like clear heat in sunshine, like a cloud of dew in the heat of harvest."[3] This representation stands out in contrast to the old popular view of God as irritable, jealous, changeable, and wilful. "It seems natural that the creator of this reposeful conception of God should have been the first to set forth quiet trust in God as a religious requirement. It is the nearest approach in the Old Testament to the Christian idea of faith."[4] Such a faith certainly must have an individualistic character.

Isaiah shared in Amos' teaching that Jahveh requires morality, not cultus. So he bitterly opposed sacrifices and feasts.

"What do I care for the multitude of your sacrifices?
it is the oracle of Jahveh.
I am satiated with the burnt offerings of rams, and
the fat of fed beasts;
And in the blood of bullocks and of lambs and of he-
goats I do not delight.
When ye come to see my fact--who has required this
at your hand?
Ye shall no longer trample my courts to bring
oblations;
Vain is incense, it is an abomination to me;
New moon and sabbath, the calling of assemblies,--

1. Isa. 6: 1. 2. Isa. 6: 3. 3. Isa. 18: 4.
4. Bade, W. F.: The Old Testament in the Light of To-day, p. 183.

I cannot bear iniquity and solemn meeting.
Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hates;
They have become a burden upon me; I am tired of
bearing it.
And when ye spread forth your hands, I will hide
mine eyes from you:
Even, when ye make many prayers, I will not hear: for
your hands are full of blood.
Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your
doings from mine eyes; cease to do evil.
Learn to do good; seek out justice, set right the
oppressor,
Judge the orphan, plead for the widow."[1]

Thus in this "Great Arraignment," as the first chapter of Isaiah has been called, the prophet makes it clear that religion which is thought to be synonymous with the cultus is not only worthless, but absolutely sinful. Religion to be acceptable in the eyes of Jahveh must be moral, and the worshippers must possess a moral character. This comes very close to the idea of individual morality.

THE REMNANT

The idea of the "righteous remnant" which is found in Isaiah has a bearing upon the growth of individualism.[2] The prophet came to see that God could not work out his purpose through the nation as a whole, but must accomplish it through the "righteous remnant,"--the pure gold of his loyal followers which remained when the dross consisting of unworthy Israelites had been removed. This thought is brought out in the following passage.

"I will take vengeance on mine enemies:
And I will turn my hand upon thee, and I will
burn out as with lye thy dross,
And I will take away all thine alloy,
And I will restore thy judges as at the first,
and thy counsellors as at the beginning:
Thereafter thou wilt be called City of Righteousness, faithful citadel."[3]

1. Isa. 1: 11-18.
2. This idea may not have originated entirely with Isaiah. He
3. Isa. 1: 24-26.

In the later additions to Isaiah much is made of this remnant. Now this idea"carries with it a distinction between Israel according to flesh and Israel according to spirit, even if Israel according to spirit consist only of those who are also in Israel according to flesh... Isaiah's remnant included his disciples and those faithful to the great prophetic ideals. Membership in the remnant, and through this a place in the future glorified Israel, was made dependent, therefore, not solely upon the fact of being an Israelite, but also upon faithfulness to the ideals of true Yahweh worship. Thus, in addition to the accident of birth as a Hebrew, there was set up a standard of character, and such a standard is in the nature of the case individualistic."[1]

IV. MICAH

The genuine messages of Micah are only fragmentary and are embedded in much later material. But we have enough of them to show that Micah was probably a disciple of Amos, and he sternly denounces the wrongs, the oppressions, and the vices of his time in much the same way as did Amos. For our purpose, however, the most important part of the book of Micah is a passage, which may have been added by a later prophetic writer, which sums up in a single statement the things which the earlier prophets had been emphasizing.

"Wherewith shall I approach to Iahweh,
And bow myself down before the God of
the Heights?
Shall I approach Him with offerings,
With burnt-offerings of yearling-calves?

Does Iahweh desire a thousand rams,
Ten thousand streams of oil?
Do I owe to Him my first-born,
My body's fruit for my sin?

may have been carrying out the suggestion of the remnant of the Elijah stories, which was composed of the seven thousand who had not bowed the knee to Baal. (See I Kings 19:18)

1. Smith, J.M.P.: The Prophet and his Problems, p. 182f.

It has been told thee what is good,
What Iahweh desires from thee, O man:
Simply to do justice, to love gentleness,[1]
To walk quietly with thy God."[2]

SUMMARY

We find in these early prophets the conviction that Jahveh's requirements are of a moral character. They distinguished sharply between religion and the cultus. They taught that the substitution of ritual for morality was sinful. Jahveh, being a moral being, required of his worshippers ethical ideals and right living. While the nation was the prophets' chief interest, yet this "continual insistence by the prophets upon ethical ideals was another step in the direction of individualism. Though the ethics of the prophets was social in interest and purpose, the basis of it, as of all ethics, was individualistic; and the prophets' application of these ethical principles to the conditions of their times was emphatically individualistic."[3]

1. The Hebrew word here used is "ḥesed." For a discussion of this word see note 1, p. 37.
2. Micah 6:6-8. (Duhm's translation, op. cit., p. 132f.) The authorship of this passage is doubtful, and the opinions of scholars concerning it differ. Ewald assigns it to an anonymous prophet of the time of Manasseh. Wellhausen and Kuenen likewise refer it to a later date. Driver inclines towards this view. Duhm on the other hand regards it as a genuine passage from Micah. For our purpose it does not greatly matter. The important thing is that the writer, whoever he was, has caught the spirit and message of these earlier prophets, and has summed them up in this matchless statement.
3. Smith, J. M. P.: The Prophet and his Problems, p. 183.

CHAPTER VI

DEUTERONOMY AND JEREMIAH

I. DEUTERONOMY

On the whole the book of Deuteronomy lies within the realm of group morality.[1] The book may be characterized as a priestly-prophetic compromise, for it reflects much of the spirit of the prophets, with its forward look and moral aspirations, and it would have had a more important effect upon the moral development of the Hebrews if it had not almost immediately fallen into the hands of those who killed its spirit by their insistence upon the letter.

For our purpose there are two important teachings of Deuteronomy which should be noted. (1) Deuteronomy teaches that Jahveh is one God. As has already been pointed out, when the Hebrews settled in Palestine, Jahveh worship was to a large extent fused, in the popular mind, with the worship of the baalim, who were many, and with whom Jahveh came to be identified. Deuteronomy stated that Jahveh was one Jahveh, that he manifested himself at but a single sanctuary, and could be worshipped there only. Thus worship was concentrated at Jerusalem. At that time this was really a forward step. The abolition of the many altars with their sacrifices and cultus was an advance in keeping with the teaching of the prophets, but the sanction of sacrifice at the one sanctuary was seized upon by the priestly element as authority for ritualism, and through their endeavors a great impulse was given to the development of legalism and sacerdotalism in the religion of Israel, which in post-exilic times almost stamped out the prophetic teachings.

It must be noted that this belief in one Jahveh was not monotheism. That the Deuteronomist still believed in the existence of other gods is clear from such a passage as this: "Take ye therefore good heed unto yourselves...lest thou lift up thine eyes unto heaven, and when thou seest the sun and the moon and the stars, even all the host of heaven, thou be drawn away and

1. Examples of this have already been noted. See supra, p. 15.

the stars, even all the host of heaven, thou be drawn away and worship them, and serve them, which Jahveh thy God hath allotted unto all the peoples under the whole heaven."[1] But this was an important step towards monotheism, which was soon after set forth by Jeremiah. Unfortunately, Deuteronomy fettered this growing conception of Jahveh with the idea of particularism.--Jahveh for Israel and Israel for Jahveh. Even in post-exilic times, long after a clear teaching of monotheism had been in effect, this particularism survived, and the exclusivism of Judaism became firmly established. So we find here a counter factor working against the dissolution of the old belief of national solidarity and exclusiveness.

(2) In Deuteronomy we come to the first definite departure from the old idea of group responsibility. The law is plainly stated, "The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers: every man shall be put to death for his own sin."[2] However, the Deuteronomist does not carry out the full implications of this teaching. He seems, rather, to limit it to civil cases of capital punishment in which Hebrews are involved. Nor does he extend this idea to Jahveh's relations to his people. To illustrate this we need but recall the words of the second commandment, "I, Jahveh, thy God, am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the third and upon the fourth generation of them that hate me."[3] In the commandment concerning the Amalekites are found the words, "Remember what Amalek did unto thee by the way as ye came forth out of Egypt... Therefore it shall be, when Jahveh thy God hath given thee rest from all thine enemies round about, in the land which Jahveh thy God giveth thee for an inheritance to possess it, that thou shalt blot out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven, thou shalt not forget."[4] Also, the curses of the twenty-eighth chapter are community-wide, showing the continuance of the old idea of communal liability. So, on the whole, it must be said that Deuteronomy is still within the realm of group morality and responsibility. But it is important to note that the idea of the responsi-

1. Dt. 4: 15, 19. 2. Dt. 24: 16. 3. Dt. 5:9.
4. Dt. 25: 17, 19.

bility of the individual has been reached in civil cases of capital punishment. This necessarily opened the way for a larger recognition of individual responsibility.

II. JEREMIAH

The book of Jeremiah offers a difficult problem for our purpose, for the writings of this prophet have suffered much from the additions and interpolations of later editors, and the very passages which bear most directly upon the question of individual responsibility are regarded by many scholars as of doubtful authenticity. However, we are certain of enough genuine passages to see that Jeremiah made a definite contribution to individualism.

Jeremiah was the "first ethical monotheist of Israel." He broke away from the old idea that while Jahveh was the God of Israel, other peoples had gods which were none the less real. He calls these other gods "no-gods." They simply do not exist.

> "O Jahveh, my strength, and my strong hold, and my refuge in the day of affliction,
> To thee shall the nations come from the ends of the earth, and shall say,
> Our fathers have inherited mere deception, vanities wherein is no profit.
> Should a man make for himself gods, which are yet no gods?"[1]

> "Thy children have forsaken me, and sworn by no-gods."[2]

It must be noted, however, that Jeremiah does not entirely get away from the national-god idea. He does not leave the other nations godless, but he does think of Israel as having an exclusive place in the favor of Jahveh. The passages which deal with the universality of God are of doubtful authenticity, and we are forced to say from the study of Jeremiah's writings as a whole that he did not carry out the implications of his ethical monotheism.

1. Jer. 16: 19. The authenticity of this passage is questioned by some scholars. Duhm regards it as secondary. Cornill regards it as genuine. If it be secondary it expresses the idea found elsewhere in Jeremiah.
2. Jer. 5: 7. See also 2: 10, 11.

This great teaching of Jeremiah,--ethical monotheism,--is the logical outcome of the teaching of the earlier prophets. They had placed great emphasis upon morality. They had made ethics the supreme concern of Jahveh. They "enthroned ethics in the very heart of Yahweh and thus made Yahweh the God of the universe. Ethics knows no national nor racial bounds; sooner or later it inevitably breaks all such restraints. The God who follows the interests of ethics wherever they may lead him is ultimately compelled to make all mankind his province. Along this path the prophets of Israel finally arrived at a monotheistic conception of God. This was not a philosophical or a speculative but an ethical monotheism,"[1] growing out of experience which the people could understand.

Jeremiah shares in the teaching of his predecessors that Jahveh is a moral being and requires of his followers moral living. So he is opposed to the whole of the cultus which the people were using as a substitute for righteousness and morality. In the face of the sanction given sacrifice in the newly found code of Deuteronomy, Jeremiah makes the claim that Jahveh gave no commands about sacrifices in the time of Moses. "Thus says Jahveh of hosts, the God of Israel: Add your burnt offerings to your sacrifices, and eat up flesh,[2] for I spake not to your fathers, nor commanded them on the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt offerings and sacrifices.[3]"

Jeremiah's attack upon the cultus included the temple also. From the teaching of Isaiah and of Deuteronomy there had grown up an inviolability party who believed that because Jahveh was with them no evil could befall them. The centralization of worship at Jerusalem, resulting from the Deuteronomic reformation, gave increased importance to this party. Since the temple was Jahveh's dwelling place he would allow no harm to come to it, nor to Jerusalem in which it was situated. Jeremiah attacks this view. "Trust ye not in lying words, saying, The temple of Jahveh, the temple of Jahveh, the temple of Jahveh, are these. For if

1. Smith, J.M.P.: The Prophet and his Problems, p. 232.
2. That is to say, "If you think you can gain holiness by eating of the sacrificial meat, why do you not also eat the burnt-offerings which are the most holy? Why not gorge yourselves with holiness?"
3. Jer. 7: 21, 22.

ye thoroughly amend your ways and your doings; if ye thoroughly execute justice between a man and his neighbor, if ye oppress not the sojourner, the fatherless, and the widow, and shed not innocent blood in this place, neither walk after other gods to your own hurt; then will I cause you to dwell in this place, in the land that I gave to your fathers from of old, even forevermore."[1] So Jeremiah places the emphasis upon moral conduct.

A logical conclusion of group morality is that the responsibility for the suffering of the present generation rests largely upon a former generation. Such a view was current in the time of Jeremiah, but this robs divine punishment of "all educative, moral, and spiritual effects." So Jeremiah opposed this view and tried to show his generation that their own sins were sufficient to merit all the punishments which they were receiving, and that they were no better than their predecessors. To this end he never tired of pointing out their sinfulness,[2] in the hope that so doing he might cause them to loathe sin, and repent, and in such event he promised them the forgiveness of Jahveh.[3] "This offer of forgiveness on condition of repentance was in itself an assurance that Israel's fate was in its own hands; it was in direct contradiction to the popular thought that the nation was doomed because of the sins of a previous generation--a thought the prevalence of which meant the death of all moral progress. According to Jeremiah, each generation determined its own fate by its attitude toward Yahweh and his demands for ethical righteousness and spiritual worship, without any let or hindrance due to the rebellious deeds of previous generations. This position seems to be the furthest point reached by Jeremiah in the direction of individual responsibility; for the great passage, 31:29f., even if it could be shown to be original,[4] evidently

1. Jer. 7:4-7. 2. See Jer. 2:19ff; 3:1ff; 5:1ff; 6:6ff; 8:6; 13:22f; 17:1f; etc.
3. Jer. 3:12f; 4:1,3ff; 7:4ff; etc.
4. The author adds a note here, which, in part, is as follows: "...The only passages in Jeremiah that can by any means be cited in support of the thesis that Jeremiah preached individualism are 31:29ff; 3:14-16; 15:1ff; 12:1ff; 17:9f; and 32:18f. These are all assigned, wholly or in part, to a later age by Duhm, Cornill, Schmidt, et al. In addition to the specific ground urged against each of these passages by these interpreters, a general objection presents itself to all. These scattered hints of individualism have no vital connection with the prophecies of Jeremiah at any point; they form no part of the burden of his soul. It is scarcely conceivable that a prophet of Jeremiah's insight and capacity, confronted by great problems in ethics and religion, and having possession of a profound truth adapted to their solution, should have contented himself with a few inci-

recognises the necessity of the operation of the old principle of solidarity in the existing regime, and postpones the introduction of the new doctrine of individualism until the incoming of the Messianic age."[1]

So Jeremiah stops short of a complete doctrine of individual responsibility. He is still within the grip of the idea of group morality, but his emphasis upon morality necessarily advanced the idea of the moral value of the individual. "This is the real bearing of the fine passage in which Jeremiah, or some one who had caught his spirit, contrasts the priestly type of religion with his own hope of a better one: 'I will put my law in their inward parts and in their heart will I write it.'[2] Conduct born of the knowledge of a law graven upon the heart is not found in the chain-gang of a formal state religion. When Jeremiah characterizes Jahveh as one who searches the heart as the seat of evil passions, and tries the kidneys as the seat of the mind,[3] even his physiological psychology goes in search of the individual. While his conception of the circumcision of the heart, of the facing about which is demanded,[4] is to be regarded as only an approximation to the New Testament idea of conversion, its implications are necessarily individualistic. Finally, Jeremiah is himself the most conspicious example in the Old Testament of religion individualized in a person. The revelations he makes of his own religious experience, his assurance of the validity of his call, his testimony to the compulsive power of his conscience,--these carry a strong implied recognition of the moral autonomy of the individual. He stands for an untraditionalized conscience and an open road."[5]

dental, lifeless allusions to it, displaying no enthusiasm concerning it and making no practical use of it. Moreover, Jeremiah was still dealing with the nation. His activities were practically ended before the nation had ceased to be. Hence the whole motive and background of his work were necessarily national. His contemporaries clung to the national idea as long as there was a vestige of hope. Indeed, the ambition for existence and power as a nation among the nations of the earth did not fail until the final fall of Jerusalem and the dispersion of the Jews to all quarters of the earth in 70 A.D. The national spirit blazed forth fiercely again in the days of the Maccabees and occasioned numerous revolts against the Romans up to the end."

1. Smith, J.M.P: The Prophet and his Problems, p. 190-92.
2. Jer. 31:33.
3. Jer. 17:9, 10; 11:20.
4. Jer. 4:5.
5. Wade, W.F.: The Old Testament in the Light of To-day, p. 278f.

SUMMARY

In the third chapter we surveyed the external forces,--environmental, social, political, economic,--which played upon and modified the idea of group solidarity in early Israel. In this and the preceding chapter we have reviewed briefly the work and teachings of the prophets, in so far as they have borne upon our problem. They, through their opposition to the cultus and their emphasis upon morals and ethics, brought about a new conception of God and religion, and prepared the way for the idea of the moral value and the moral responsibility of the individual. We have now brought our survey down to the time of the Exile, and find Jeremiah on the threshold of the realization of this great doctrine of individualism and individual responsibility. But it was left for Ezekiel, a younger contemporary of Jeremiah, and a great prophet of the Exile, to clearly enunciate and define this doctrine for the first time.

CHAPTER VII

EZEKIEL AND THE EXILE

I. THE EXILE

The Exile was a most critical time for the Hebrew nation, and especially for the religion of Jahveh. With the deportation of many of the best citizens of the land in 597 and the fall of Jerusalem in 586, great changes took place among the Hebrews. The fall of Jerusalem meant the end of Israel as a political kingdom. This was bound to bring about new social and religious views. Under the early view of the solidarity of the nation, and of the nation and Jahveh, such a calamity could but mean that Jahveh was inferior to the gods of the Babylonians, and so was unable to prevent this great disaster. Perhaps some of the Hebrews still maintained this view and did transfer their allegiance to the gods of their conquerors. But the prophets had been preaching another doctrine, and their message had become widespread. They taught that because of the sins of the people Jahveh was compelled to withdraw his favor from them and so leave them to the mercy of their enemies. Thus their own sins were responsible for this calamity, and the armies of their conquerors were but the instruments of Jahveh with which he punished them. Instead of Jahveh being overthrown by the defeat of his people, he became "King of kings and Lord of lords."

With the Exile the interest changed from the political unit which bound the people together, and became religious, the nation becoming a religious organization.[1] Thus the nation did not cease to exist, but remained a nation among the nations, and still the favored people of Jahveh. "It was coming to be seen, however, that the basis of this closer fellowship was to be found not in any clan or family relationship but rather in the moral and spiritual superiority of Israel as compared with all other

1. Many scholars have held that the Exile marked the dividing line between nationalism and individualism, that individualism had its beginning with Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and that the cessation of the nation left only individuals to be dealt with. This is not strictly true, for as we have seen, individualism had already had a long development, and many factors had entered into it. Furthermore, while the nation ceased to exist as a political unit, there was still a national religious consciousness, and this became under Judaism even more exclusive than had the political group.

peoples. The national communion with Yahweh being thus conditioned by a character qualification, the individualising of the relationship between him and his people was bound to follow in due course."[1]

Let us note briefly some of the factors of the Exile which aided in the growth of individualism. (1) We have already mentioned the cessation of the nation as a political unit, and the deportation of many of the Hebrews. This made strongly against the old idea of national solidarity. The Hebrew people were weak in comparison with their conquerors and could not hope to offer effective resistance. So their hope became religious, and the prophets strove to fix their interests upon morals and spirituality; and these are always individualistic.

(2) In the deportation of the Hebrews little attention was paid to clan and family ties.[2] So the new community rested on an individualistic basis. This was made easier by the fact that for the most part it was the leaders of the nation's thought and action who were deported.[3]

(3) The removal of the Hebrews from Palestine meant depriving them of worship at Jerusalem, the only place where, according to Deuteronomy, they ought to worship. While they were in Judea the temple was always easily accessible, but now they could no longer worship as members of the community in its one place of worship. Consequently the religion, if it continued to exist (and it did), had to become more of a personal relationship between the individual and Jahveh, and this prepared the soil of their hearts for the seed of individualism."

(4) The Babylonian civilization constituted an important factor in the development of individualism. This civilization was much more advanced than that of the Hebrews, and the individual had gained far greater independence and larger rights than among the Israelites. The Babylonians were a great commercial people, and as we have pointed out above, commerce always makes for individualism. So living among a people where individualism was freely recognized, and in taking part in their

1. Smith, J.M.P.: The Prophet and his Problems, p. 187f.
2. Ezk. 24: 21. 3. II Kings 24: 14-16.

undertakings it is natural that the Hebrews should also be influenced by these views, for each man now had to stand or fall on his own individual merits. Since religion was inseparably bound up with life as a whole it was inevitable that religion should be influenced by this individualistic view.

(5) The religion of the Babylonians also had become quite individualistic. J.M.P. Smith points out that their penitential psalms "reflect a very keen sense of personal guilt and personal responsibility for the same. Definite expression to the doctrine of individual responsibility for sin is given in the narrative of the deluge,[1] where the god Ea addresses the god Bel as follows:

> "Ah, thou wise one among the gods, thou warrior,
> How rash of thee to bring about a flood storm!
> On the sinner visit his sin,
> And on the wicked his wickedness.
> But be merciful, forbear; let not all be destroyed!
> Be considerate; let not everything be (confounded.)!"

This is the beginning of a distinct protest against the injustice of destroying the righteous with the wicked, in the form of a plea that some punishement other than a deluge, one which would render possible the escape of the righteous, be employed. With the inheritance of the religious experience of Israel during the preceding centuries, and amid such a social and intellectual environment as Babylonia furnished, it was perfectly natural that Israel in exile should respond to the stimulus of providential circumstances in part by the clear formulation of the doctrine of personal responsibility for sin."[2]

II. EZEKIEL

The pre-exilic prophets confined their message almost entirely to the nation as a whole. "Ezekiel defines his mission as that of caring for the souls of individuals. He is the watchman appointed of Yahweh unto the house of Israel to warn each man of his danger and indicate the way of escape."[3] He represents Jahveh

1. "Gilgamesh Epic, tablet XI, ll. 180ff. The rendering given above is that of Doctor Wm. Muss-Arnolt, as found in R.F. Harper's 'Assyrian and Babylonian Literature' (1901), p. 357."
2. Smith, J.M.P.: The Prophet and his Problems, p. 198-200.
3. Ibid, p. 201.

as saying to him, when he gave him his divine call to the prophetic office among those who had been carried away captive, "Son of man, I have made thee a watchman to the house of Israel: therefore hear the word that I speak, and give them warning from me. When I say to the wicked, Thou shalt surely die, and thou givest him not warning, nor speakest to warn the wicked from his wicked way, to save his life; the same wicked man shall die in his guilt; but his blood at thy hand will I require. Yet if thou warn the wicked, and he turn not from his wickedness, nor from his wicked way, he shall die in his guilt; but thou hast saved thyself. Again, when a righteous man turns from his righteousness, and does evil, and I lay a stumblingblock before him, (so that) he die: because thou hast not given him warning, he shall die in his sin, and his righteous deeds which he has done shall not be remembered; but his blood at thy hand will I require But if thou warn the righteous man not to sin, and he does not sin, he shall surely live, because he took warning; and thou hast saved thyself."[1] Thus in the statement of his call we find his individualism appearing.

The clearest statement of his doctrine of individualism, which he develops in detail, appears in the eighteenth chapter. Since this passage is so important for our purpose we will quote from it at length.

"The word of Jehovah came to me again, saying, What mean ye, that ye are using this proverb in the land of Israel, saying,

"The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge? As I live, says the Lord Jehovah, ye shall not any more use this proverb in Israel. Behold, all souls are mine; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine: the soul that sins, it shall die. But if a man is righteous, and does justice and righteousness, and has not eaten upon the mountains, neither lifted his eyes to the idols of the house of Israel, neither has committed adultery, neither has come near to one that is unclean; and has not wronged any, but has restored to the debtor his pledge, has not robbed any one, has given his bread to the hungry, and has clothed the naked; who has not lent on interest, neither has taken any increase, who has for-

1. Ezk. 3: 17-21.

saken iniquity, has executed real justice between man and man, has walked in my statutes, and has kept my judgments, to deal truly; he is a righteous man, he shall surely live, says the lord Jehovah. [10]If he beget a son that is a violent man, a murderer, and that does any one of these (forbidden) things... shall he (i.e.,the son) then live? he shall not live: he has done all these abomination: he shall surely die; his blood be upon him.

[14]"Now, lo, if he beget a son that sees all his father's sins, which he has committed, and fears, and does not commit the same...he shall not die for the guilt of his father, he shall surely live. As for his father, because he cruelly oppressed, robbed his brother by force and did wrong among his people, behold he shall die in his guilt. Yet say ye, Why does not the son bear the guilt of his father? When the son has done what is lawful and right, and has kept all my statutes, and has done them, he shall surely live. [20]The soul that sins, it shall die: the son shall not bear the guilt of his father, neither shall the father bear the guilt of his son: the righteousness of the righteous shall be for himself, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him."*

Ezekiel's purpose in laying down this doctrine of individual responsibility was distinctly practical. He was working among people who believed that they were suffering from the result of an evil inheritance. Their fathers had sinned and they had to suffer the penalty. In this situation Ezekiel laid down the principle that every soul stands in an independent relationship to Jahveh, and that the conduct of another can neither bring judgment upon him, nor secure immunity from his sins.[1] He even went so far as to state that a man's own past life will not hinder or help him in the coming judgment. The only thing that counts is his actual status at the time of the judgment.[2] Thus if a man who has been righteous commits a sin, and dies in his sin, he is lost, and if a wicked man repents and becomes righteous, his past sins will not be remembered against him. Since then the responsibility rests upon the individual, there is a

*Ezk. 18: 1ff. See also Ezk. 9: 4f; 11: 18-21; 14: 12ff.
1. See in addition to Ezk. 18, Ezk. 14: 12-23.
2. See Ezk. 21-28; 33: 10-20.

strong appeal for the unrighteous man to turn from his sins, and for the righteous man to remain righteous. "Cast away from you all your transgressions, wherein ye have transgressed; and make a new heart and a new spirit: for why will ye die, O house of Israel? For I have no pleasure in the death of him who dies, says the Lord Jehovah: wherefor turn, and live."[1]

It is to be noted that Ezekiel's doctrine of individualism is somewhat extreme and one-sided. He broke away entirely from the old view of group solidarity and group responsibility, and under the urge of the practical purpose which led him to put forth his doctrine, he went to the opposite extreme. His individualism is "an atomistic individualism," which is not entirely true to real life. It is an undeniable fact that there is in human life a degree of social solidarity, for the ties of heredity and environment do bind men together, and the innocent do often suffer with the guilty. No man can live entirely to himself.

Furthermore, Ezekiel does not completely break with the national-god idea. To him Jahveh is primarily the God of Israel's land.[2] Israel is still the favored nation; and the true worshippers of Jahveh are always Israelites. "There is a spiritual Israel, indeed, but it is at the same time made up of those who belong to Israel according to the flesh, the Hebrews of the Hebrews... His community is , of course, composed of individual members all of whom sustain right relations to God; they live, however, not for individual ends but for the furtherance of the purpose of the community, which is the revelation of God's glory to the world."[3]

Although Ezekiel's doctrine of individualism is somewhat extreme and is not entirely consistent, yet he did make a most important contribution to Hebrew thinking by setting forth, for the first time in Hebrew writings, a clear cut recognition of individual responsibility. This was a great forward step, for while we can never get away from the fact of a degree of social solidarity, a recognition of individual moral responsibility is necessary for a moral and ethical order of society.

1. Ezk. 18:31, 32.
2. Ezk. 16; 20:40; 25:14; 28:24-26; 35:10; 36:16-38; 38; 39; 48:7.
3. Smith, J.M.P.: The Prophet and his Problems, p.205f.

Conclusion.

We have traced the growth of individualism from the early days of the Hebrews, when the individual as such had practically no recognition, down to the rather extreme "atomistic individualism"of Ezekiel. We have seen that this development was not due to any one factor, nor to any one person, but was the outgrowth of many factors,--social, economic, political, moral, and religious,--and that many persons made contributions to its growth. Of course, it is not to be assumed that this doctrine, once clearly formulated, immediately became widely accepted, for it takes time for new ideas and new ideals to enter into the life and thinking of the masses, and besides, there were counter forces working against this idea of individualism. Nor is it surprising that we find the ideas of group solidarity and individualism going along side by side, for the human mind is such that it can often hold to two inconsistent views at the same time.

The post-exilic period offers a fruitful field for a further pursuit of this subject. But the extended treatment which it would require would carry us beyond the bounds of this present treatise. However, a few of the main factors which influenced individualism in this later period will be briefly noted.

1. The post-exilic prophets, like their predecessors, confined their interest largely to the nation as a whole. "They may distinguish somewhat more sharply than the preexilic prophets between the two classes of the righteous and the wicked in Israel,[1] and at times may also speak more directly of the redemption of individuals.[2] But on the whole they deal almost exclusively as the earlier prophets with the nation and its future. And so it is also with the priestly successors of Ezekiel. Here and there we may observe a slightly more developed individualism,[3] but on the whole the postexilic law and priestly histories represent substantially the same standpoint as that of preexilic times. The nation in the racial sense is still a unit,[4] and the solidarity of the family is still assumed."[5][6]

1. Mal. 3: 13-18; Isa. 65: 9-16.
2. Isa. 43: 6f; Joel 2: 28-29.
3. For example, Num. 16: 22; Neh. 1: 5ff.
4. Lev. 4: 13ff.
5. Esth. 9: 13f.
6. Knudson, A. C.: The Religious Teaching of the Old Testament, p. 346.

2. The Exile, as we have already noted, replaced the political unit by a religious unit which became just as exclusive, or more so, than the political unit had ever been. So it would seem that the old idea of group solidarity was still predominant. But forces were still at work against this view, and the book of Ruth and the book of Jonah appeared as two important protests against this exclusivism and particularism.

3. The influence of the sages upon individualism has already been noted. They were particularly active in this post-exilic period, and it is from this period that most of the wisdom literature comes. Yet they do not always hold consistently to the idea of individual responsibility. Nevertheless, their work as a whole was decidedly individualistic.

4. In the discussion of Deuteronomy we noted the rise of a priestly party, who, taking the newly found law, killed its prophetic spirit by their insistence upon the letter of the law. This priestly party predominated in post-exilic times, and the religion which they set forth was mainly one of ceremony or "keeping of the law." So the prophetic conception of religion, which made for individual morality and individual relationship to God, was opposed by the ritualistic religion of the priests.

5. But, on the other hand, the rise of the synagogue, with its stress on prayer and religious instruction, had an individualistic tendency.

6. The idea of individual responsibility and individual retribution, as set forth by Ezekiel, raised the whole problem of suffering. If there is an individualizing theodicy, men asked, why do the righteous suffer? The book of Job was an attempt to answer this question. The whole problem of suffering thus forms a very important chapter in the study of individualism

7. The development of a belief in immortality, although never very fully developed in the Old Testament, had a bearing upon the idea of the worth of the individual.

But it was left for Jesus to give the individual his rightful place. He, for the first time, really recognized the true value and worth of the individual soul.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Badè, W.F.: The Old Testament in the Light of To-day. Boston, 1915.

Bennett, W.H.: The Theology of the Old Testament. London, 1900.

Day, Edward: The Social Life of the Hebrews. New York, 1901.

Knudson, A.C.: The Religious Teaching of the Old Testament. New York, 1918.

Marti, Karl: The Religion of the Old Testament. Tr.by G.A. Bienemann. New York, 1907.

Peters, J.P.: The Religion of the Hebrews. Boston, 1914.

Robinson, H.W.: The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament. New York, 1913.

Smith, H.P.: The Religion of Israel. New York, 1914.

Smith, J.M.P.: The Prophet and his Problems. New York, 1916.

Smith, W.R.: Lectures on the Religion of the Semites. 2d ed. London, 1914.

Soares, T.G.: The Social Institutions and Ideals of the Bible. New York, 1915.

Wallis, Louis: Sociological Study of the Bible. Chicago, 1912.

Ehrhardt, E: Article, "Individualism" in Hasting's "Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics," vol. VII, p. 218ff.

The following books in German, which were not consulted, contain material upon the subject.

Bousset, W.: Religion des Judentums, Berlin, 1886.

Löhr, M: Sozialismus und Individualismus im Alten Testament, Giessen, 1886.

Smend, R: Lehrbuch der alttestamentliche Religionsgeschichte. Freiburg im Br., 1893.

Stade, B: Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments. Berlin, 1906.

End of

The growth of individualism among the Hebrews

This title was preceded by

The building of a curriculum for the religious education of adolescents of senior high school age

Apocalypticism in Buddhism

The use of the New Testament in the curriculum of religious education for early adolescence

And is continued by

The search for truth in India

Search by above titles on archive.org to continue reading this collection of Pacific School of Religion Theses from 1923

call number Thesis Cage 1923

End of

The growth of individualism among the Hebrews

This title was preceded by

The building of a curriculum for the religious education of adolescents of senior high school age

Apocalypticism in Buddhism

The use of the New Testament in the curriculum of religious education for early adolescence

And is continued by

The search for truth in India

Search by above titles on archive.org to continue reading this collection of Pacific School of Religion Theses from 1923 call number Thesis Cage 1923